

Abilene Christian University

Digital Commons @ ACU

Stone-Campbell Books

Stone-Campbell Resources

1922

Review of O.E. Payne's Book on "Psallo"

M. C. Kurfees

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books



Part of the [Ancient History, Greek and Roman through Late Antiquity Commons](#), [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Byzantine and Modern Greek Commons](#), [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), [History of Christianity Commons](#), [Liturgy and Worship Commons](#), [Practical Theology Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kurfees, M. C., "Review of O.E. Payne's Book on "Psallo"" (1922). *Stone-Campbell Books*. 61.
https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books/61

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Stone-Campbell Resources at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Stone-Campbell Books by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU.



0 3064 0166 0510

REVIEW
OF
O. E. PAYNE'S BOOK
ON
"PSALLO"

BY
M. C. KURFEES

SEWELL
264.2
K96re

NASHVILLE, TENN.
McQUIDDY PRINTING COMPANY
1922

ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

Library

SEWELL BIBLE LIBRARY

Gift of
Jesse P. Sewell



*Read and return to
J. Y. McQuigg Abilene Texas
Jan 21 - 1923*

REVIEW
OF
O. E. PAYNE'S BOOK
ON
"PSALLO"

BY
M. C. KURFEES

SEWELL
264.2
K96re

NASHVILLE, TENN.
McQUIDDY PRINTING COMPANY
1922

#24940542

62577
LIBRARY

ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
ABILENE, TEXAS

PREFACE.

The book of which the following pages are a review was heralded far and wide as the last word on the vexatious question of instrumental music in Christian worship. It was proclaimed by the advocates of such music as a complete settlement of the question at issue, and there seems to have been great rejoicing over what was regarded as a signal triumph for their side of the question. But the candid and impartial reader of this review cannot fail to discover, in the light of the scholarly attainments and invincible logic of its author brought to bear in the examination of Mr. Payne's book, the simple fact that the author of the book has not only most signally failed, either from history, scholarship, or the word of God, to sustain his contention, but that it also reveals the fact that Mr. Payne is *wholly incompetent* to deal with the question involved, as shown by his lack of scholarship and candor in handling what others have written on the subject.

An indication of the estimate placed upon the review is seen in the loud call which has come from numerous competent judges among its readers that it be published in permanent book form; but it is due its author to state the fact that he did not undertake the work because, in his judgment, there is any *merit* or peculiar strength in Mr. Payne's book, but because of the many earnest requests from thoughtful brethren from different sections of the country and because of the possible harm calculated to be done the cause of truth by the *gross misrepresentations* in the book in the hands of the uninformed.

This review, in the judgment of very many competent readers, is one of the most thorough and forceful exposures of error and the strongest vindication of God's word against the corruption of his worship ever offered to the public. I bespeak for it an extensive circulation, and feel assured that no advocate of instrumental music in Christian worship can successfully assail the facts therein found. Those who desire to follow God's word should feel deeply grateful to the author of this review for the masterly work he has done in exposing Mr. Payne's false positions.

F. W. SMITH.

April 12, 1922.

REVIEW OF O. E. PAYNE'S BOOK ON "PSALLO."

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS.

In consenting to make a public notice of this book, it is proper, under the peculiar circumstances attending its publication, that I should offer a word of explanation. This is made necessary, as the reader will see, by the author's disrespectful and discourteous use of my name in its pages and his wanton reflection upon my veracity, on account of which, all things else being equal, I should pay no attention whatever either to his book or to anything else he might have to say.

Before its appearance in print, Brother J. B. Briney and I were selected to examine the manuscript of his book and to submit to its author, if we would, a joint statement of our judgment of its argument. Brother Briney occupies the same doctrinal position with the author of the book; but, in conducting an argument, he knows how to be courteous and respectful toward those who differ from him; and, although on the question of instrumental music in Christian worship, it is a case of "war to the knife and no quarters" between him and me, yet we are on the most friendly and cordial terms, and I esteem him very highly, not only for his character as a Christian gentleman, but also for his attainments in the world of letters. When he finished his examination of the manuscript and turned it over to me, we agreed that, when I should complete my examination of it, we would meet and compare notes.

But here a very unexpected as well as unpleasant situation soon came to light. I had not proceeded far with my examination of the manuscript until I was shocked as well as surprised that the author deliberately condescended not only to the use of positively discourteous and disrespectful references to brethren differing from him on the subject of his argument, but that he would actually charge them with downright insincerity and willful misrepresentation! His style descended so far below the plane of common courtesy among Christians, charging me in particular with stating in my book on music what I knew was not true when I stated it, that I saw clearly before completing my examination of it that I could not, consistently with proper self-respect, make any statement to such an author about such a production. Why should I make any statement at all to a man who says I state what I *know* is not true when I make statements? On page 201, referring to a statement of mine in my book, he says: "Then follows a statement which knowingly misrepresents." That is, according to this man, I deliberately made a statement to the public *which I knew to be false when I made it!!* If what he says were true, I would not be fit to be a member of the church of God, much less to be writing books attempting to instruct Christians in divine worship; and ordinarily when I discover such uncivil statements in a publication, I lay it down without reading another line of it; but, in deference to my arrangement with Brother Briney, I read it all and then invited him to dine with me at the Watterson Hotel, where we might have our proposed conference. We spent a pleasant day together, but I promptly informed him that I must respectfully decline to join in a statement to an author who, in the same breath in which he calls on us for a statement about his book, charges me with stating what I know to be false when I make statements. I suggested to Brother Briney that he, or some other friend in sympathy with the author's doctrinal position, ought to advise him to omit from the published volume the ugly things in question. Whether he ever so advised or not, I do not know; but as far as I can recall, practically all the

ugly insinuations which marred the manuscript appear in the printed volume. In addition to those already noted, on page 71, those differing from him are "pettifoggers," they "employ chicanery," and do not *believe* what they *say* about *psallo*, but are only "feigning that the meaning of *psallo* changed"! On page 82 he says they have "pretended that the meaning had changed"! On page 142 he says if I had not already "said of record that the horse is seventeen feet high," I would now admit that "it is impossible to *psallein* without" instrumental music! That is, according to him, I have become convinced that the New Testament authorizes instrumental music in the worship, but because I have "said of record that" it does not authorize it, *I belie myself by continuing to say that it does not!* On page 189 he questions "the motive" of those differing from him and charges that their claim about *psallo* is a "fabrication"!

Now, when I clearly saw, as all who have made a thorough study of the field of evidence can see, not only that the argument of the book is wholly inconclusive, but that it is also marked by such incivility in style, I reached the settled conviction that it needed no review or reply whatever, but carried with it its own ultimate defeat, and hence decided to pay no further attention to it at all. But numerous letters and requests have reached me from intelligent men and women in several of the States and from Canada, asking me to review it; and hence, not because they think the argument is conclusive, for they make no such claim as the basis of their request, but because of the possible harm which such persons, whose judgment in such a matter I do not feel at liberty to ignore, think such a book may do among the uninformed, is my only reason for giving it any public notice at all.

Moreover, since consenting to notice the book publicly, I have gathered other significant facts in the light of which I will leave our readers to decide whether its author is reliable in his dealing with the language of other authors either living or dead. For example, on page 281, to give the appearance of dignity and force to his contention, this

man professes to be giving a quotation from Dr. A. T. Robertson, of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, of Louisville, Ky. He first gives the high standing of Dr. Robertson, his learning as a Greek scholar, his authorship of Greek grammars and numerous other books, and then puts in quotation marks and attributes to Dr. Robertson the following statement about me:

"We have a preacher by the name of Kurfees, here in Louisville, who is so much opposed to instrumental music that he stands aloof from, and will have nothing to do with, his own brethren who use instruments."

Dr. Robertson and myself have both lived here in Louisville at the same time for more than thirty years, and I not only know him to be a scholar, but a Christian gentleman; and when I saw this alleged quotation, I felt morally certain that he had never made any such reckless statement about me; yet there it stood in quotation marks (!!) and attributed to him in this book! Hence, a few weeks ago, I addressed to Dr. Robertson the following letter:

"Hotel Watterson,
Louisville, Ky., October 3, 1921.

"Dr. A. T. Robertson,
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary,
Louisville, Ky.

"My Dear Dr. Robertson:

"In a recent book by O. E. Payne, you are represented as making the following statement about me: 'We have a preacher by the name of Kurfees, here in Louisville, who is so much opposed to instrumental music that he stands aloof from, and will have nothing to do with, his own brethren who use instruments.' Now, even if the statement with other remarks attributed to you did not have the appearance of a careful attempt to reproduce something from memory, still I could not, for a moment, believe that one in your station would make such a statement about me, and I would not even call your attention to it were it not in quotation marks and represented as your own deliberate statement. For this reason alone, I merely ask, did you ever make such a statement about me? Kindly let me hear from you, and oblige,

"Yours most fraternally,
"M. C. KURFEES."

Without any delay, I received the following prompt reply:

"Southern Baptist Theological Seminary,
"Louisville, Ky., October 3, 1921.

"My Dear Brother Kurfees:

"I have your favor of October 3 relative to the book by O. E. Payne, which I have not seen. I only recall that some years ago a brother by that name came here from Canada to work in the library. I do not recall what position he took about instrumental music. I gave him data about some books that could help him and probably my own idea of some passages of which he asked me. The remark about you I do not recall at all, and certainly he took a lot of liberty to inject a personal remark into a book whether I said it or not. Certainly I have always had only the kindest feelings toward you, and respect your rights to your views about instrumental music as about anything else. I judge Brother Payne to be a decided controversialist in the light of his use of me.

"Cordially yours,

"A. T. ROBERTSON."

Exactly so. "A lot of liberty" indeed! Dr. Robertson no doubt stated, as was his unquestionable right, his dissent from the position occupied by myself and others on the music question, but never made any such statement about me as is attributed to him in this book; and our readers will see, before we are through, that this is a fair sample of the "liberty" which this author takes in dealing with the language of others besides Dr. Robertson. He may not belong to the class sung in the eighteenth century by Edward Young,

"Some for renown, on scraps of learning dote,
And think they grow immortal as they quote,"

but he will likely gain some notoriety from his manner of quoting.

It is no part of my purpose, nor have I so promised, to make a detailed review of this book; but I shall call attention to enough of its contents and its methods of argumentation to show that it is thoroughly inconclusive, not only failing to establish the author's conclusion, but that from its own premises, if they be true, it establishes a conclusion as repulsive to him and those standing with him as it

is to his opponents—a conclusion which they, in common with the rest of us, heartily reject.

I begin my criticism of the doctrinal position of this book by calling attention to its title-page. Following the title of the book, "Instrumental Music is Scriptural," the author places conspicuously on the title-page the following language of Lucian: "It is impossible to 'psallein' without a lyre." I am not wholly ignorant of Lucian's writings and his place in Grecian literature. In fact, as I write these lines, a copy of his works in the original, including the passage in question, is open before my eyes, and at the proper time, in the course of my criticism, I shall call attention to his remark and to its bearing and value in the present controversy. Suffice it to say just now that the author of this book has hit wide of the mark on Lucian, but my only purpose at this point is to examine the use which he makes of Lucian's remarks. That he himself does not understand Lucian to restrict his words to a "lyre" exclusively, although Lucian uses the word "lyre," but that it merely means *some kind of musical instrument*, may be clearly seen by his own rendering of the same passage on page 140: "Paul tells us to 'psallo.' Lucian rejoins: 'That is impossible without a musical instrument.'" Exactly so; and later on we shall have further use for this important fact.

We thus far see that, according to this author's construction of Lucian's language, some kind of musical instrument is indispensable in obeying the New Testament command to psallein—that "it is impossible to psallein without a musical instrument." I heartily indorse this construction of Lucian's language; but to the position that it is restricted to the lyre, harp, piano, organ, or some other instrument *made by human hands*, which is the position of the book here under review, I respectfully demur. More of this at the proper time.

Then, in addition to this title-page display of Lucian and his passing remark about certain arts, the author parades Lucian and his little squib on eighteen other pages of his book, and on page 135, seemingly infatuated with the Gre-

cian satirists's remark, he speaks of it as "that gem by Lucian." Well, before we are through with Lucian, we shall find that this "gem" adorns quite a different idea from that set forth by this badly misguided instructor in philology and Christian doctrine.

CHAPTER II.

THE CONCLUSION NECESSITATED BY THE TITLE-PAGE.

Although, as already announced, I am not to make a detailed review of this book, it is, nevertheless, deemed advisable to make a complete exposure of the irrational, absurd, and fatal conclusion to which some of its testimonies, with the construction it places upon them, and particularly its title-page display, necessarily and inevitably lead. Sometimes to point out what the logicians call the *reductio ad absurdum* is the best of all ways to show the unreasonableness and untenableness of a position; and I propose to show that, if Paul, Chrysostom, and Lucian, who are linked together and conspicuously displayed on the title-page of this book, are to be jointly construed as this book construes them, then just such an impracticable and fatal conclusion is the inevitable result of the position advocated in this book. Of the correctness of this statement, our readers may judge for themselves when the facts are stated.

Now, on the hypothesis that the book here under review is right in its position on *psallo* as used by Lucian, and its assumption that it necessitates the same position on *psallo* in the New Testament, then it is just as indispensable to have and to use a musical instrument made by human hands when we attempt to *psallein* in the worship of God as it is to have immersion when we attempt to baptize. If not, why not? It is my profound conviction that the ad-

vocate of instrumental music in the worship of God does not live who can successfully attack this position. In further elucidation of it, I here quote a paragraph from my reply to one of the recent inquiries about the Payne book, as follows:

"If O. E. Payne's position on *psallo* is true, then we are *commanded* to play instrumental music when we engage in divine worship; and when we do not play it there, we are in rebellion against God. Of course whatever is in *psallo* God commands to be done, just as whatever is in *baptizo* he commands to be done; and we have no alternative in either case except either to do what is in the word or be in rebellion against God. There is no escape here. The conclusion is simply inevitable. God commands us to '*psallo*,' and no matter what it means, that is what we are commanded to do; and if the position advocated by this man is correct, then every church that does not play instrumental music in its worship is in rebellion against God, precisely as those are who refuse to be baptized."

That is the position to which the author of this book has inescapably committed himself and those who stand with him. In accepting that position, it is folly to talk about having instrumental music in the worship when it is convenient and not having it when it is not convenient. If instrumental music is in the word *psallo* as immersion is in the word *baptize*, which is the exact thing for which this book contends, then of course we have not obeyed the command expressed by the word *psallo* till we *play instrumental music* any more than we have obeyed the command expressed by the word *baptize* till we *immerse*. With all becoming modesty, on the hypothesis assumed by this book, I respectfully challenge any philologist or translator to call this statement in question. Hence, according to this doctrine, no church is obeying God's command to *psallo* until it uses a lyre, harp, piano, organ, or some other instrument made by human hands, and every church failing to have and to use such an instrument in its worship is in open rebellion against God. No matter when nor where Christians undertake to have that part of the worship expressed by *psallo*, they do not have it until they use such an in-

strument. In fact, the author of this book has been driven pell-mell into the absurd and self-defeating position which it was clearly seen twenty-five years ago the advocates of instrumental music would be compelled to assume if they followed their own logic on *psallo* to its only consistent and legitimate end. The title-page itself, by its combined use of Paul, Chrysostom, and Lucian, makes the use of an instrument made by human hands so inseparable from *psallo* that, although by its use of Chrysostom it concedes that "it is possible to *psallein* without the voice"—that is, one can *psallein* merely with an instrument made by human hands without the voice—yet by its use of Lucian it contends that "it is impossible to *psallein*" merely with the voice without an instrument made by human hands. That is, according to this book, we can *psallo* completely without the voice, but we cannot *psallo* at all without an instrument made by human hands.

Hence, it follows from the inexorable force of facts and logic that *mere singing* does not meet the demand in *psallo*; for, according to this Payne book, "it is impossible to *psallein* without a musical instrument" *made by human hands*, and to *psallein* is the thing which God tells us to do. According to this doctrine, any attempt to have this part of the worship by mere singing is disobeying God in precisely the same way that men disobey him when they attempt to obey the command to baptize by merely sprinkling water on a person. It is impossible to baptize without immersion, and when we merely sprinkle, we are not obeying the command to baptize; but the Payne book says "it is impossible to *psallein* without a musical instrument" *made by human hands*, and when we merely sing, we are not using a musical instrument made by human hands, and therefore, according to the Payne book, we are not, in any such case, obeying God's command. This is as clear and conclusive as it is that two and two are four. Hence, there is simply no escape here, and the advocates of instrumental music must either do this way or discard the Payne book doctrine, one or the other.

Moreover, this position on *psallo* is not only contrary to

the word of God, but it is contrary to every dictate of both reason and righteousness. As clearly revealed in the Scriptures, our Heavenly Father not only has the most sympathetic consideration for the humblest and poorest of his children, but it is distinctly declared that "righteousness and justice are the foundation of his throne" (Ps. 97: 2); and hence it is a matter for the profoundest gratitude that the humblest band of his children, no matter how poor, may still provide the loaf and fruit of the vine, pray, exhort, and sing his praises acceptably without the expense of an organ, piano, lyre, violin, or some such instrument; and yet the book here under review says, and displays it on its title, page, with repeated emphasis in the body of the book, that "it is impossible" for them to do it! I meet this unjust reflection upon the Author of the worship, which is for the poor as well as the rich, by saying that to stipulate such a condition in a system of worship which is designed for all classes, all places, all circumstances, and all conditions of the people universally, is contrary to every principle of justice, reason, and righteousness. If the ancient children of God, regardless of poverty conditions and other circumstances, had been required to duplicate in different places and under all circumstances, after the manner of New Testament local churches, the ponderous system of the Jewish tabernacle and temple worship with the latter's instruments of music, it would not only have been wholly impractical, but a serious reflection upon the justice and wisdom of its Author; but the tabernacle was portable and the temple worship was restricted to one place, and the expenses in both cases were borne by the whole nation. But the law regulating worship under the Christian system requires Christians, in any and all localities wherever they may live, to assemble themselves together for the worship of God; and yet the book here under review conspicuously proclaims on its title-page and repeatedly emphasizes the doctrine in the body of the volume that "it is impossible" for a band of Christians to conduct this worship acceptably, so far as the command in *psalmo* is concerned, until they procure an organ, piano,

lyre, violin, or some such instrument of music!! The position is utterly preposterous and absurd in the extreme, and if *psallo* meant any such thing, its employment in a passage stipulating the duty of Christians under all circumstances and regardless of property conditions would be strong presumptive evidence that the passage never came from God.

The next chapter will begin the argument from Greek lexicons.

CHAPTER III.

THE FUNCTION AND AUTHORITY OF LEXICONS.

In this chapter and the one immediately following, with possibly a third, in addition to settling the meaning of the special word *psallo* if the highest lexical authority can settle it, it is the purpose to present the proper place of the lexicon and its authority in the settlement of disputed questions in general. With all right-thinking persons who carefully read the book here under review and who understand the legitimate function and limits of a lexicon, its uncouth and arbitrary handling of this class of witnesses, and especially its handling of Thayer and Sophocles, will be a heavy discount on its reliability; but, without leaving the matter to rest upon a mere assertion, I shall present the facts and let them speak for themselves in verification of the statement.

To simplify the argument from the lexicons and make it the more intelligible to the reader, I think it proper to present the matter in the way of an answer to the two following questions: (1) *What was the original or primary meaning of psallo?* (2) *What were its applied meanings in classic Greek and in the New Testament?* On both of these questions the facts of history are clear and explicit, and it is the purpose to summon enough of them to put the matter beyond all reasonable doubt or dispute.

To the average student, nothing is more interesting in

the study of philology than the process of change and modification in the history of words. This, however, does not necessarily mean, as some have hastily and incorrectly concluded, that the original idea in a word is necessarily lost because the word has undergone various and even radical changes. There are instances in which it is completely lost and no longer appears in any current use of the term. The word "book" is a vivid example in point. In current usage, as is generally understood even by the common people, it means, as Webster says, "a collection of sheets of paper bound together, printed or not. A composition; a treatise." But not only is this *not* the original idea, which is now completely lost in all usages of the term, but I doubt if one person in a thousand ever heard of the original idea. It traces back to the Anglo-Saxon word *bece*, meaning "*beech*," and a literary composition was called "book" because the ancient Saxons of the third and fourth centuries "wrote on beechen board."

The word "soldier" is another vivid example in point. In current usage, it always and everywhere means "one engaged in military service," and even in the figurative uses of the term, some of which occur in the New Testament, the same idea is preserved. But this is the width of the poles from the original idea in the word, which is now completely lost in all uses of the term, and I doubt, precisely as in the case of the term "book," if one person in a thousand ever even heard of the original idea. The term traces back to the Latin word *solidus*, meaning a piece of money which was the pay of one engaged in military service, and hence one so engaged came to be called a "soldier."

But there are other instances of radical change in the meaning of words in which the original idea persists through all the various mutations of a word and may be plainly seen in every usage it ever had whether literal or figurative. Both the words *baptizo* and *psallo*, as we shall see, are examples in point. We are now ready to consider facts on the two proposed lines of investigation.

1. *What was the original or primary meaning of psallo?*

It is purely a waste of time, in such a case, to quote a large number of lexicons of inferior rank, and I shall therefore confine myself, in the present case, to the very highest authority in both classic and New Testament Greek. Speaking for the former, the eminent lexicon of Liddell & Scott says: "*Psallo, to touch sharply, to pluck, pull, twitch.*" There, in clear and explicit terms, we have the original meaning of the word. Let the reader carefully note that, in this original meaning, nothing is said about any particular object that one might "touch sharply," "pluck," "pull," or "twitch." In other words, the term merely meant "to touch sharply, to pluck, pull, twitch," regardless of the object that might be touched, plucked, pulled, or twitched.

Speaking for New Testament Greek, Joseph Henry Thayer's world-renowned lexicon says: "*Psallo, to pluck off, pull out; to cause to vibrate by touching, to twang.*" Again let it be noted that no particular object inheres in the original meaning of the term to the exclusion of other objects, the word merely meaning "to pluck off, pull out, to cause to vibrate by touching, to twang," regardless of the object that one might pluck off, pull out, cause to vibrate by touching, or twang. According to these same high authorities, several Greek words, of which *psallo* is one, all trace back to the original root *psao*, which Liddell & Scott define as meaning "*to touch lightly, rub, wipe, rub smooth,*" and Thayer, "*to rub, wipe; to handle, touch,*" and that, too, without reference to any particular object to the exclusion of others; and in this respect, as we have seen, it is like its derivative *psallo*.

Hence, if we are to respect the highest authority in the world to-day in both classic and New Testament Greek, the original and primary meaning of *psallo* was to touch or strike, not the strings of a musical instrument necessarily, nor any other particular object necessarily, but merely to touch or strike whatever the object might be. And hence, we are face to face with the irresistible conclusion that neither playing nor singing, neither instrumental music nor vocal music, inheres in the original meaning of the word

psallo, but that it merely meant to touch or strike, and the object touched or struck might be one thing or another according to the circumstances of the case. And this opens the way for our second question.

2. *What were the applied meanings of psallo in classic Greek and in the New Testament?* In other words, to extend the question so as to cover the entire field of Greek literature, how was the word used by those who spoke and wrote the Greek language both in the classic period and in the New Testament and cotemporaneous literature? Turning again to Liddell & Scott, we find the following applied meanings:

(1) Back to the remote period of the Greek tragic poet, Æschylus, four hundred years before Christ, it meant "*to pluck the hair.*"

(2) At the time of the Athenian poet, Euripides, who was partly cotemporaneous with Æschylus, it means "*to twang the bowstring.*"

(3) In the *Anthologia Palatina*, made up of selections of various dates from Greek literature, but all before Christ, this example appears: "*Schoinos miltophures psallomene*, a carpenter's red line, which is *twitched* and then suddenly let go, so as to leave a mark."

(4) "Mostly of the string of musical instruments, *to play a stringed instrument with the fingers*, and not with the plectron."

(5) "Later, *to sing to a harp*, Septuagint Ps. 7: 17; 9: 11; Eph. 5: 19; *psallo to pneumati*, 1 Cor. 14: 15."

(6) Agreeing with and confirming this for the classic period, Thayer says: "Septuagint for *niggen* and much oftener for *zimmer*; *to sing to the music of the harp.*"

(7) Thayer then adds: "In the New Testament *to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song.*"

Now, from all the premises thus supplied by these, the world's most eminent lexicographers who define Greek in English, the word *psallo*, extending over a period of about five hundred years, passed through the following modifications or applied meanings—namely, it meant to pluck the hair, to twang a bowstring, to twitch a carpenter's line, to

play a stringed musical instrument, to sing to a musical instrument, and finally to sing. And let the reader never forget that from the very earliest usage of the word, while it retained and carried through all its subsequent mutations its original meaning to touch or strike some object, yet no particular object inhered in the word to the exclusion of other objects. Neither the hair, a bowstring, a carpenter's line, the strings of a musical instrument, nor the human heart inhered in the word, but through five hundred years of its history it came to be applied to all of them. Hence, to Anglicize the verb *psallo*, one, at different periods of its history, could *psallo* with the hair, *psallo* with a bowstring, *psallo* with a carpenter's line, *psallo* with the strings of a musical instrument, and *psallo* with the human heart. Thus it is clearly seen that the word carried its original meaning to touch or strike through all its changes even in its last sense "to sing," though here, as we shall presently see, its use is figurative, precisely as the word *baptizo* carries its original meaning to *immerse* in its figurative use in the New Testament. Thus, persons completely possessed by or overwhelmed with the Holy Spirit were figuratively said to be *baptized* in it. The same figurative use of *baptizo* is found in Greek literature outside of the New Testament. In *The Educator*, Clement of Alexandria says: "For drowsy is every one who is not watchful for wisdom, but is *baptized* (*baptizomenos*) by drunkenness into sleep." (Book II., chapter 2.) Of course "plunge," or some equivalent term, would be a correct translation of this Greek participle into English, and "sprinkle" or "pour" would be out of the question.

Isidorus, a writer of the fifth century of the Christian era, says: "Most men, therefore, *baptized* (*bebaptismēnoi*) in ignorance, have their minds incapacitated for consolation with reference to afflictions; but those, on the contrary, who are governed by sound reason, repel them all." (Book II., Epistle 76.) Here again, to translate the term into English, we must say "*immersed* in ignorance," or

use some equivalent expression. Numerous similar examples could be given.

Now, on precisely the same principle, when *psallo* came to mean to sing, it was a figurative use of the term—that is, singing with figuratively striking the vocal chords or chords of the human heart just as one of its classical meanings was literally to strike the chords of a musical instrument. The author of the book here under review, pages 86 and 122, attempts to ridicule the idea of “striking,” “touching,” or “plucking the chords of the human heart” as a figurative use of *psallo*, and even says that I “deduced” the idea from Robert Milligan. But, independent of anything in the Bible on such a point, the merest novice in the use of metaphorical language knows that this is a correct characterization of this use of the term, and I shall now present facts which show that not only I, but the learned Robert Milligan and all others who properly read and respect the New Testament have “deduced” a complete confirmation of the idea from Paul the apostle. In my book on music, referring to Thayer’s definition of *psallo* as used in the New Testament and his omission therefrom of all its classic meanings, I state the fact that “when this prince of New Testament lexicographers comes to the New Testament period, he omits all of these meanings, and limits it to touching the chords of the human heart.” On page 86 of his book, this man Payne, referring to the words “touching the chords of the human heart,” says they “are totally untrue.” Now, this rash and groundless statement, as we shall see, is another illustration of the utter unreliability of this book. Its author seems to be of the opinion that his bare assertion, when he has nothing else to offer, is sufficient to carry his point. Let the reader now note the facts. I said that Thayer, in defining *psallo* in the New Testament, limited it to “touching the chords of the human heart.” All that is necessary to prove that my statement is *totally true* instead of “totally untrue” is to appeal to Thayer’s own words. Here they are: “In the New Testament to *sing a hymn*, to *celebrate the praises of God in song*.” Thus, he

does not give even the remotest hint that *psallo* means anything else in the New Testament but to sing; but if this is not limiting it to "touching the chords of the human heart," then what other "chords" are touched or what else is done when persons sing? Moreover, as to the absurd position that Thayer does not say it does *not* mean something else in the New Testament, anybody, capable of judging such matters, knows that if *psallo* had some *other meaning* in the New Testament and he failed to give it, he would be a wholly unreliable New Testament lexicographer.

Let us here raise the very pertinent question, *what is the function of a lexicon?* It is to define words. But, in such a connection, what does "define" mean? Webster says: "To fix the bounds of," "to mark the limits of." A lexicon, then, is "to fix the bounds" or "to mark the limits of" words. Of course this means that it must fix such "bounds" or such "limits" as include *all that belongs to the meaning of the word*, and everything not so included is excluded. Hence, the correct definition of words is both inclusive and exclusive. It includes all that the word means, and whatever it does not include is excluded from the meaning of the word; otherwise it is no correct definition at all. This is the meaning and scope of a lexicon. But, according to the author of this book, since persons dance as well as play the piano as an accompaniment of singing, therefore to sing means *to dance!* If not, why not? Yet in his book, page 101, he makes the lame statement: "If a newspaper were reporting the public appearance of a Jenny Lind" and should state "that she 'sang,'" though it did not mention an instrument, "every intelligent reader would suppose, as a matter of course, that there was a piano accompaniment." But "every intelligent reader would" *know* that neither the piano nor any other instrument made by human hands was in the word *sing* any more than *dance* is in it. Of course singing can be accompanied by the piano or by any other instrument just as it can be accompanied by the dance, but neither the piano nor any other such instrument nor the

dance is in the word *sing*; and we have seen that the eminent New Testament lexicographer, Thayer, marks the limits of *psallo* in the New Testament by the word "sing."

Now, it so happens that Paul, in one passage, confirms this use of *psallo* in the New Testament as figurative, thus: "Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord." (Eph. 5: 19.) The words "making melody" in this passage represent the word *psallo* in its participial form; and whether we take the word "heart" as the instrument *with* which or the object *on* which the *psalming* is done, in either case it is a figurative use of *psallo*, for it is impossible either to strike or touch the heart or to strike or touch something else with the heart *literally*; but in singing, there is, speaking figuratively, a striking or touching the vocal chords, or "chords of the human heart," just as in the ancient classical meaning of the word there was a literal striking of the chords of a musical instrument. As the scholarly Robert Milligan expressed it: "The antithesis here," in such a use of *psallo*, "is certainly very marked and seems to be intentional and significant." ("Scheme of Redemption," page 386.)

Finally, for profound learning and wide research in the whole field of Biblical lore, Robert Milligan, at the time of his death in 1875, was perhaps unsurpassed by any of his cotemporaries, and he was particularly versed in the meaning of Greek and Hebrew words. I close this chapter with the following comment on *psallo* by this pious and learned man:

"The word *psalm* is from the Greek noun *psalmos* and this again from the verb *psallo*, to touch, to feel, to play on a stringed instrument with the fingers, and, finally, to make music or melody in the heart as in Eph. 5: 19. The meaning of the noun corresponds with that of the verb and denotes a touching, a playing on a stringed instrument, any song or ode. And hence it is evident that the word *psalm* may or may not refer to instrumental music. Its proper meaning, in any and every case, must be determined by the context. And, according to this fundamental law

of interpretation, it is pretty evident that, in Ephesians and Colossians, the term *psalmos* has no reference to instrumental music; for, in both cases, it is the strings or chords of the heart, and not of an instrument, that are to be touched." ("Scheme of Redemption," page 380.)

CHAPTER IV.

THE FUNCTION AND AUTHORITY OF LEXICONS.

(Continued.)

In continuing the argument from the lexicons, it is proper to note, in this connection, and to keep constantly in mind two vital facts established in Chapter III. (1) That the legitimate function of a lexicon in all languages is to define words and that the correct definition of a word includes all that the word means and excludes everything else. Hence, to state exactly what a word means, no more and no less, is to define the word correctly, and the slightest variation from this rule is a violation of the principles of lexicography in all languages. (2) That the very highest lexical authority in the whole English-speaking world on New Testament Greek is Thayer's great work and that it defines *psallo* to mean "in the New Testament to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song." That is, he uses the verb "sing" and the noun "song" to "fix the bounds" or "mark the limits of" the verb *psallo* in the New Testament. This means that, according to this great lexicon, there is nothing in *psallo* in the New Testament which is not in "sing" or "song." Hence, we are here confronted by the significant and weighty fact that, no matter how many lexicons are produced either in the book here under review or anywhere else that say *psallo* in the New Testament has instrumental music in it, they are all, in the field of New Testament Greek, inferior to Thayer and are therefore placed at the decided disadvantage of arraying themselves against the highest authority

-19-

62577
LIBRARY

ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
ABILENE, TEXAS

in the world. Is any well-informed and thoughtful person prepared to adopt a position that has only such support?

But, for reasons that will appear, I now introduce the testimony of the great lexicon of Sophocles, equally eminent in his particular field, the Roman and Byzantine periods from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100, which includes the New Testament era. For this entire period covering about twelve hundred years, here is his definition: "*Psallo, to chant, sing religious hymns.*" Thus, this native Greek, this mighty master of his native tongue, who was honored as professor of the Greek language for thirty-eight years in Harvard University, uses the verbs "chant" and "sing" to "fix the bounds" or "mark the limits of" *psallo* throughout this long period. Is not this significant?

Now, Sophocles is not introduced here because his testimony is needed in determining the meaning of the word *psallo*, for after the highest authorities in the world in classic Greek and New Testament Greek—the lexicon of Liddell & Scott and that of Thayer—have spoken, the testimony of others is not needed. But since the great work of Thayer, the highest authority in the world on New Testament Greek, uses the English verb "sing" and the noun "song" to "fix the bounds" or "mark the limits of" *psallo* in the New Testament, thus limiting it to vocal music, and since this position is supported by the eminent lexicon of Sophocles covering the Roman and Byzantine periods and including the New Testament era, these eminent authorities constitute a most serious and insurmountable barrier against the advocates of instrumental music in Christian worship, and hence, from their very first appearance in print, it has been a perplexing and bewildering problem to know how to meet them, and because of the light this circumstance sheds on the situation, I introduce Sophocles. Men noted for their learning, piety, and integrity, and who advocate the use of instrumental music in divine worship, have been annoyed and embarrassed no little with this problem of how to meet Thayer and Sophocles; but the author of the book here under review, while

seeming to feel the force of the difficulty, has no trouble in brushing it aside seemingly to his own satisfaction and in his own characteristic way. Where great men and scholars have stood speechless before the problem and have failed to show a way out, he has "cut the Gordian knot" *by attempting to cast discredit upon Sophocles and by actually changing and suppressing the language of Thayer!* I shall now give, in his own words, his statement of the case, and shall also give the facts as they are in Thayer's lexicon with the facts also concerning Sophocles, and then leave the reader to decide how far such a book is reliable.

In my book on "Instrumental Music in the Worship," commenting on Thayer's definition of *psallo* in the New Testament and his omission therefrom of its classic meanings, I said:

"When this prince of New Testament lexicographers comes to the New Testament period, he omits all of these meanings and limits it to touching the chords of the human heart, saying that it means 'in the New Testament to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song.'"

A part of this passage was quoted in Chapter III. to show that Paul himself refutes the author's denial about "the chords of the human heart." I quote it now to show his change and perversion of Thayer's language. On page 86, immediately following this quotation from my book, he says:

"In exactly the same way this same 'prince of New Testament lexicographers' defines: '*Baptizo*, to dip repeatedly, to immerse, to submerge. In the New Testament it is used particularly of the rite of sacred ablution.' If Thayer had stopped there, as many lexicographers did, what would Mr. Kurfees and those who agree with him as to baptism and instruments say if Ditzler, Rice, Morrison and affusionists generally should stoop to pretend that outside the New Testament *baptizo* signified immersion, but that in the New Testament it signified some other act, performed some other way, and as proof, point to such definitions, of which there are a number, that give as much warrant for their doing so, as Thayer and some others do for feigning that outside the New Testament *psallo* means to play an instrument, or to sing to one, but that in the New Testament it signifies some other act, performed some other way?"

Note how he says, "If Thayer had stopped there;" but Thayer did *not* "stop there," and the attempt by the author of this book to make the impression by either stopping there in quoting Thayer or by any other way that Thayer treated *psallo* "in exactly the same way" that he treated *baptizo*, is a *glaring and gross misrepresentation*. We shall see that Thayer's treatment of the two words is not only different, but radically and vitally different; yet, in order to camouflage or break the force of Thayer's phrase "in the New Testament," which the lexicographer uses in introducing his New Testament definition of *psallo*, this man not only changes the arrangement of Thayer's words, but he actually suppresses from Thayer's definition the very thing which, if he had given it, would have utterly defeated his point by showing that Thayer *does the very reverse* of what he represents him as doing. More than fifty pages earlier in his book he very freely gave this suppressed part when discussing the meaning of *baptizo* apart from *psallo* and the music question, but he suppressed it here when giving it would have defeated his point on the meaning of *psallo*. I regret to have to expose such dealing by one author with another, but I cannot properly reply to this book without it. Here is the way this man quotes and suppresses Thayer: "In exactly the same way this same 'prince of New Testament lexicographers' defines: '*Baptizo*, to dip repeatedly, to immerse, to submerge. In the New Testament it is used particularly of the rite of sacred ablution.'" (Page 86.)

Now, I cheerfully concede that in quoting a passage it is not improper sometimes to omit a part of it which is not material to the point in hand, but in all such cases fair and honorable dealing requires the use of some mark indicating the omission; yet between the phrase "to submerge" and the phrase "in the New Testament," Thayer uses twenty-five lines containing over one hundred and fifty words, all of which this man omits with no mark indicating omission. But this is not all nor by any means the worst that he does, for he then *suppresses* the very part of Thayer's definition of *baptizo* "in the New Testa-

ment" which shows that Thayer, in the case of the latter, did the very *reverse* of what he did in the case of *psallo*—namely, in the case of *baptizo*, Thayer shows, by specific statement, that the classical meaning and the New Testament meaning *are identically* the same, but in the case of *psallo* he shows, by specific statement, that the classical meaning and the New Testament *are not the same*. Here is Thayer's New Testament definition of *baptizo* with the part given which this man suppressed:

"In the New Testament it is used particularly of the rite of sacred ablution, first instituted by John the Baptist, afterwards by Christ's command received by Christians and adjusted to the contents and nature of their religion (see *baptisma* 3), viz., an immersion in water, performed as a sign of the removal of sin, and administered to those who, impelled by a desire for salvation, sought admission to the benefits of the Messiah's kingdom."

Thus, Thayer distinctly says that *baptizo* "in the New Testament," precisely as he had just defined it in classic Greek, is "an immersion in water." But this man suppresses the fact. And why? Shakespeare's Hamlet, replying to a dark question, is made to say, "Ay, there's the rub," but in the present case the facts are luminous and the answer is ready at hand. By changing the arrangement of Thayer's words at one place and suppressing a part of his definition at another, the author of this book makes it appear to his readers, who know not the facts, that the phrase, "in the New Testament," used by Thayer in the case of both *baptizo* and *psallo*, is no more proof of change from the classical meaning to a different meaning in the one case than it is in the other; that there is no more to indicate that the classical meaning and New Testament meaning are the same in the case of *baptizo* than there is to indicate that they are the same in the case of *psallo*; and therefore that "Ditzler, Rice, Morrison and affusionists in general" have the same proof that *baptizo* "in the New Testament" means "some other act" than immersion that "Mr. Kurfees and those who agree with him" have for contending that "outside the New Testa-

ment *psallo* means to play an instrument, or to sing to one, but that in the New Testament it signifies some other act." But, as the reader can now see, he makes this point not only at the expense of making a statement which is not correct, but by perverting and suppressing Thayer's words. He says: "In exactly the same way" Thayer treats *baptizo* and *psallo*. *This statement is a positive misrepresentation.* It is true, as he shows, that Thayer introduced the New Testament definition of both *baptizo* and *psallo* with the phrase, "in the New Testament," but Thayer not only does *not* treat *baptizo* and *psallo* "in exactly the same way," but he distinctly says that the former "in the New Testament," precisely as in classic Greek, is "an immersion in water;" whereas in his treatment of *psallo* when he comes to the New Testament, *he omits all of the classical meanings and limits psallo to singing or vocal music.*

Now, in connection with such dealing with Thayer, he tells the reader what *he thinks* Thayer meant, thus: "The evident meaning of Thayer's entire definition is: 'Outside the New Testament, *psallo* means to play a stringed instrument,' 'to sing any kind of music—patriotic, secular, pagan or festive—to the harp.' But in the New Testament, 'to sing God's praises, to the harp' of course." (Page 86.) But if Thayer meant that, *why did he not say it?* He *did* say it in the case of *baptizo*—that is, when he comes to the New Testament he repeats the classical meaning, as being the New Testament meaning. Why did he not do it in the case of *psallo*? The answer is, because in the case of *psallo* the New Testament meaning is *not* the classical meaning, but a different meaning, and consequently Thayer gives what that different meaning is.

But let us test this mean's logic on this point. According to his contention, it was not necessary for Thayer when he came to the New Testament to repeat the classical meaning of *psallo* as being the meaning of the word "in the New Testament;" that he meant for it to be taken for granted that the meaning was the same, only it was there applied to "sacred" things. Then, if this be true,

why did he do differently in the case of *baptizo*? Why did he not say: "In the New Testament it is used particularly of the rite of sacred ablution," and stop there? If the meaning of *psallo* in the New Testament is the same that it was in classic Greek and it was therefore unnecessary to repeat that meaning when he came to the New Testament, then, since the meaning of *baptizo* in the New Testament is the same that it was in classic Greek, *why was it necessary to repeat that meaning when he came to the New Testament?* It is a strange lexicographic principle that, in the case of two words with the same meanings in the New Testament that they had in classic Greek, it is necessary for a lexicographer to say so in the one case, but not necessary for him to say so in the other. But that is the lame logic of this book.

The facts of the case are that *baptizo* in both classic Greek and in the New Testament means "an immersion in water," and Thayer's lexicon says so; and that *psallo* in classic Greek means "to strike the chords of a stringed instrument" or to make instrumental music, and "in the New Testament" it means "to sing"—that is, strike the chords of the "heart" or make vocal music, and Thayer's lexicon so represents it. In fine, Thayer says that *psallo* in classic Greek means "to play on a stringed instrument, to play the harp," but that "in the New Testament" it means "to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song;" and hence, if Thayer represents the case correctly, then just as certain as it is that playing is not singing and singing is not playing, just that certain it is that, according to the highest authority in the world on New Testament Greek, singing is taught and enjoined in the New Testament and playing is not.

But, in accordance with the promise in Chapter III., I will now show from the facts that this man's handling of Sophocles, though he does not misrepresent what Sophocles says is the meaning of *psallo*, is, nevertheless, quite as remarkable for other reasons as is his handling of Thayer. In fact, in attempting to break the force of the great scholar's testimony, his treatment of the latter is more

presumptuous and reckless than was that of the former. As it will shed a bright light on his manner of judging literary matters and hence form a proper background for a correct judgment of his book, I now give, in his own language, what he sends forth to the world as *his* estimate of this great Greek scholar and his lexicon.

1. In my book on "Instrumental Music in the Worship," I say of Sophocles that "he sifted every passage in Greek literature, but did not find where *psallo* means to sing with an instrument." But this man says in reply: "Sophocles does not say, neither does his lexicon, that he sifted little or much on this question." (Page 167.) Sometimes both in books and otherwise men *say* things by their deeds in a more emphatic way than by their words, and there is a popular adage to the effect that "actions speak louder than words;" and if this man wished to advertise his ignorance of the vast and prodigious work of Sophocles, or his recklessness in handling that author's great lexicon, he could not have hit upon a more fitting statement for that purpose than the one just quoted. For the reader's information, I state the fact in reply that I myself took the pains to make a careful survey and count the long list of Greek authorities consulted and used by Sophocles as the basis of his great work, and was able, as may be seen on page 47 of "Instrumental Music in the Worship," to make the following statement:

"The Greek lexicon of Sophocles, himself a native Greek, and for thirty-eight years professor of the Greek language in Harvard University, covers all of the Roman period and the Byzantine period down to the end of the eleventh century, in all more than twelve hundred years' history of the language from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100. As the basis of his monumental work, this profound and tireless scholar examined, as we have found by actual count, 146 secular and 77 ecclesiastical authors of the Roman period, and 109 secular and 262 ecclesiastical, modern Greek, and scholastic authors of the Byzantine period, a grand total of 594 authors and covering a period of more than twelve hundred years."

2. Now, notwithstanding such an array of such significant facts indicative of wide and thorough research in Greek literature, through the long period of twelve centuries, this man, in an effort to belittle Sophocles himself and lessen the force of his testimony, says: 'He obtained his definition from within the walls of the monastery rather than from without in the world of letters.' (Page 65.) Again: "He spent the first half of his life with his uncle and other monks in connection with a Greek monastery, . . . which . . . may account for his definitions." (Page 75.) Still again: "It is but natural to inquire: 'How came Sophocles to define *psallo* to sing?' . . . Sophocles' connection with a monastery during the impressionable first half of his life adequately accounts for his definition." (Page 77.)

Now, just as if it were a fact, this man says Sophocles "spent the first half of his life" in a monastery; but, turning to the New International Encyclopedia, we get what *are* the facts that Sophocles was born near Mount Pelion, in Thessaly, Greece, March 8, 1807, and died at Cambridge, Mass., in the United States, December 17, 1883, in the seventy-seventh year of his age; that he received his earlier education at the convent on Mount Sinai, but emigrated to the United States in 1829 and continued his studies in Amherst College. (See the New International Encyclopedia, Volume 21, page 292.) Thus, he was only a boy twenty-two years old when he came to this country, where more than fifty-four years of his life were spent and where he was really educated in Amherst and other institutions of learning. Yet this man says he "spent the first half of his life with his uncle and other monks in connection with a Greek monastery"!! Thus he gives us another sample of the marked inaccuracy of things in the book we are now examining.

3. But the most ludicrous if not indeed the most ridiculous thing in this book is its author's attempt to act in the rôle of *critic of Sophocles as a scholar*! Shades of Maimonides, Erasmus, Schleiermacher, and all the rest!! He even attempts to belittle the eminent Grecian as a

lexicographer and tries to make the impression, no doubt succeeding at least with some who do not know the facts, that this Harvard professor who says *psallo* from 146 B.C. to A.D. 1100 meant "*to chant, sing religious hymns,*" was not much of a scholar after all. As we have already cited for another purpose, here is what he says of Sophocles: "He obtained his definition from within the walls of a monastery rather than from without in the world of letters"! (Page 65.) He not only speaks of him as "this habitue of the monastery" (page 76), but speaks slightly of high estimates of Sophocles as "the pretension that, like Simon of Samaria, Sophocles 'himself was some great one'" (page 78); and that some write of him "as if the lexicographer were a prodigy of learning" (page 78).

Well, on the hypothesis that Sophocles was the very small man as a lexicographer that he is here represented to have been, *what a prodigy he was after all!* Logicians tell us it is sometimes best to meet an erroneous position by meeting its advocates on their own ground, and we shall pursue that course in the present case. Harvard University is the oldest and most heavily endowed institution of learning in the United States, being founded early in the seventeenth century, about three hundred years ago, and famous all over the world as a seat of learning. The reader can get a fair idea of its standing by noting the relative endowment of a dozen of the leading institutions of learning in our country. Beginning with the smallest in the list and ending with the largest, here are the facts: Brown University has an endowment of \$5,500,000; Rochester University, \$6,125,000; Northwestern University, \$6,520,000; Oberlin College, \$6,600,000; Princeton University, \$9,564,000; Washington University, \$10,249,000; Johns Hopkins University, \$15,000,000; Cornell University, \$16,702,000; Yale University, \$24,000,000; Stanford University, \$24,55,000; Chicago University, \$30,000,000, and Harvard University, \$43,000,000. Not only does the last rise in the list nearly five times more than Princeton, nearly three times more than Cornell, and about a

third more than Chicago, but nearly twice the endowment of Yale; and yet, according to the author of this book, this incompetent Thessalian hailing from Mount Pelion, who was hampered by confinement "within the walls of the monastery" and not broadly educated "without in the world of letters;" this unscholarly Evangelinus Apostolides Sophocles, too ignorant to define words in his native tongue, so completely hoodwinked Harvard University and the rest of the world as to keep himself in its department of Greek for thirty-eight years! *Was there ever such a prodigy?!* But this is not all. According to the American Cyclopaedia, this prodigy hailing from the home of Xenophon, Plato, and Demosthenes, so completely hoodwinked Yale University as to get its A.M. degree in 1837, and so hoodwinked Harvard again as to get the same degree from it in 1847, and so hoodwinked the Western Reserve College as to get its LL.D. degree in 1862, and so continued to hoodwink Harvard as to get the same degree from it in 1868, and finally so hoodwinked the makers of the Americana and the New International Encyclopedia as to get himself written down as an "American Greek scholar" and "a Greek American classical scholar"! Then, to cap the climax, the magic spell created by "this habitue of the monastery from whom was shut out the light beaming from "the world of letters," was still so powerful even three years after his death as to lead "the President and Fellows of Harvard College" at a meeting in Boston in 1887 "to authorize the publication" of a "Memorial Edition" of his Greek lexicon "and to entrust the whole matter to Professor Joseph Henry Thayer." *There now!* Along with the President and Fellows of Harvard College, even Thayer, the great Joseph Henry Thayer, whose New Testament lexicon even the author of the book here under review actually concedes is a "scholarly work" (page 28) and a "truly great New Testament lexicon" (page 86), became a victim of the same magic spell and joined in a scheme to extend the circulation of this unimportant lexicon over the world! Elijah ridiculed Baal's prophets; but, with all due respect for brethren

who attempt on honorable grounds to defend, as they have a right to do on such grounds, instrumental music in the worship, those false prophets no more deserved ridicule at the hands of the great prophet of God than does a man now who, in order to break the force of weighty testimony against his sectarian position in religion, will attempt at the expense of contradicting facts to belittle a great scholar and his work of whom all these things can be said.

CHAPTER V.

THE FUNCTION AND AUTHORITY OF LEXICONS.

(Concluded.)

In addition to submitting some facts not hitherto considered in the present investigation, it is the purpose, in this concluding chapter on the argument from the lexicons, to focus all the main facts in the lexical line that the force of the argument from this source may be duly felt and appreciated. Instead of wasting time on all the authors in this line quoted in great number in the book here under review, I shall meet the entire lexical situation, in so far as it has not already been met, by showing, from the testimony of some of his own witnesses in the realm of lexicography and taken from the very list which he parades in his book, that they not only distinctly testify against his position and in favor of that of the opposition, but that they include the very highest authority in the world on New Testament Greek. Hence, if this can and shall be done—our readers themselves may be the judges after I submit the facts—then, no matter how confidently and strenuously the advocates of instrumental music in the worship may contend for the practice, nor how severely they may denounce the opposition, they will not only find themselves arrayed against the latter in the present controversy, but, as intimated in a previous chapter

of this review, also in the very unenviable attitude of being arrayed against the very highest authority in the world on New Testament Greek. Surely such facts will be calculated to give all properly thoughtful persons serious pause and prevent their adoption of any such position.

There is no dispute about the meaning of *psallo* in classic Greek, and the lexicons now to be examined, although unanimous in the position that it there means to play an instrument of music, nevertheless, when they come to the New Testament, are equally unanimous in the position that it there means to sing. As we have already seen, there is one New Testament passage, Eph. 5: 19, which, in the phraseology of the original, distinctly alludes to its ancient classic meaning to *touch* or *strike*, and represents Christians as *figuratively psalloying in or with the heart*—that is, *touching or striking the chords of the heart*. But we will now let these lexicons speak for themselves as they are quoted in this book:

1. *Hesychius' Lexicon*. He lived the latter part of the sixth and the first part of the seventh century A.D. He says: "*Psallein*—to sing songs; to pluck; to set in motion." Although he helps to swell the list of lexicons introduced in this book, yet not a word does he say in support of instrumental music, nor does he even mention the subject in any way at all.

2. *Greek Lexicon A.D. 1816*. Here, without naming its author or otherwise describing the work, this book quotes a Greek lexicon of the nineteenth century. Here, according to this book, is what it says: "*Psallo*, properly *psallein*, signifies to touch and cause to sound the strings with the tips of the fingers. By a change of use, it also refers to singing songs, singing psalms." Will the reader please note that this lexicon distinctly declares that it was "by a change of use" that *psallo* came to mean to sing? Hence, according to this authority, the word did not always have that meaning, but it came to have it "by a change of use"—the very thing for which the opposition in the present controversy contends and in which they are thus solidly sustained.

But here again on page 52, the author of this book, true to the method which he constantly employs wherever the testimony of an authority goes strongly against him, attempts to break the force of it by his use of a footnote comment. He knew how the reader would be impressed with that phrase, "by a change of use;" and hence, promptly applying his footnote device, he carefully connects it with the phrase "by a change of use," thus: "That is, '*psallo*, to play; by a change of use, *also* to sing.'" *But that is not what the lexicon says.* It is what the man who tampers with the language of authors says. Here is what the lexicon says: "*Psallo*, properly *psallein*, signifies to touch and cause to sound the strings with the tips of the fingers. By a change of use, it also refers to singing songs, singing psalms." Thus the lexicon places a period, a full stop, at the end of the classic meaning, and introduces the new meaning with the phrase "by a change of use," but his footnote perversion uses a semicolon and thus jumbles together the classic meaning and the later meaning as if they were one and makes it difficult for his readers to see that any distinction is made between the two. The verbal change appears to be slight, but it is sufficiently vital to be misleading, and it is accomplished at the expense of omitting several words which appear in the lexicon, changing the punctuation, and placing the word "also" in a different grammatical position, all of which artful rearrangement of words is to break the force of the lexicon's testimony; but I respectfully refuse to accept such an emendation or to allow it to mislead the reader if I can prevent it. The fact is, this lexicon, in clear and unmistakable terms when they are not tampered with, confirms the position that *psallo*, in the course of its history, took on the new meaning to sing, and it is this new meaning that meets us in the New Testament.

3. *Scapula's Lexicon.* "*Psallo*, I touch, I strike, and touch with a certain light movement. Thus musicians are said to *psallein* their own strings, to strike the cithara, to play on the lyre or simply *psallein*. Likewise, metaphorically, *psallo* with songs and glorify the Lord with hymns.

I sing praises to the Lord." There it is again as clear as the cloudless sunlight. Let the reader note that "metaphorically," that is, figuratively, *psallo* means to sing, and this meaning is called metaphorical—another word for figurative—because persons strike nothing *literally* when they sing, but they do strike the chords of the heart *figuratively*. Thus, this lexicon also confirms the later meaning of *psallo*, which meaning we find in the New Testament.

4. Jones' *Greek and English Lexicon*: "*Psallo*, I play on a musical instrument; sing; sing to a name; celebrate." "*Psalmos*, a sound made by a musical string; a sacred song, psalm." It is a noteworthy fact that, while all of these lexicons begin with the ancient classical meaning to "play on a musical instrument," they all end with the later meaning to sing, thus showing that the word came to signify vocal music, and the New Testament confirms this in specific terms when it points out the heart as the instrument on which or with which Christians are to *psallo* in the worship of God.

5. Bagster's *Lexicon*. "*Psallo*, to move by a touch, to twitch; to touch, strike the strings or chords of an instrument; absolutely to play on a stringed instrument; to sing to music; in New Testament, to sing praises. Rom. 15: 9; 1 Cor. 14: 15; Eph. 5: 19; James 5: 13." Let the reader again note how strictly Bagster follows the same beaten track, giving, in significant unison with Thayer and others, the classical meaning, "to play on a stringed instrument," but then proceeds to say, as do the others, that it means "in the New Testament, to sing praises." Like others, too, he is sufficiently specific to cite the passages in the New Testament where the changed meaning is exemplified.

6. *New Greek-English and English-Greek Lexicon by Contopoulos*. Like Sophocles, this author is himself a Greek, and here is the significant definition given in his lexicon: "*Psallo*, to sing, to celebrate." "*Psalmoidos*, a psalmist, a singer of psalms, a bard, a minstrel." But here again, the author of the book now under review, true

to his characteristic method, promptly applies his footnote device in an attempt to break the force of its testimony, but he makes an inglorious failure. Referring to Contopoulos, he says: "In the preface, the author says: 'A modern Greek dictionary must comprise all the elements that constitute the modern language. . . . But why should an additional dialect be created?'" Then, without the slightest relevancy of the "statements" to the point he attempts to make, he says: "Such statements by a modern Greek, in a lexicon for modern Greeks, Orthodox Church adherents, will enable the reader to see why the definitions by Contopoulos and Sophocles, differing from the world of scholarship, give a vocal significance to *psallo*." But *how* do they "enable the reader to see" *any such thing*? There is absolutely no connection between the two things and not the slightest bearing of the one upon the other. He might as well have said the Biblical fact that Abraham came from Ur of the Chaldees "will enable the reader to see why the definitions by Contopoulos and Sophocles" *are what they are!* The jingle of such irrelevant comment may serve to divert attention from what these lexicons say, but it cannot hide their real testimony nor break its force with thoughtful readers.

But the author of this footnote device overdoes the matter in this instance when he adds: "The Greek church makes no more pretense of adhering to the teachings and practices of the New Testament than does Rome." This statement is not only untrue on its face and in every word, but, as even the casual student of such matters can know, it is in open and flagrant conflict with all the facts of history on the subject. A mere tyro in ecclesiastical history and the baptismal controversy knows that it is a fact that, in spite of the introduction of sprinkling as a substitute for immersion and its perpetration by the church of Rome, the orthodox Eastern church, which understands and speaks the Greek language, has always held on to immersion and does so to this good day even to the extent of immersing infants. This is certainly a most important and significant "pretense of adhering to the teachings and

practices of the New Testament" to a far greater degree "than does Rome." In spite of this wordy and irrelevant footnote, it is a fact that, when discussing the baptismal question, all the advocates of instrumental music in common with those who oppose it, very properly use and magnify into the most vital and solemn importance the historic fact that the Greek church, which has always understood and spoken the Greek language, has tenaciously and significantly held on to immersion. And instead of being misled by such an inexcusable and perverted use of this fact, the reader is entitled not only to its full force as it stands on history's page to the credit of the Greek church against the practice of Rome on *baptizo*, but also to the force of the additional significant fact that stands on history's page to the credit of the same church against the practice of Rome on *psallo*. Hence, instead of its being true that "the Greek church makes no more pretense of adhering to the teachings and practices of the New Testament than does Rome," it is a most significant fact, gloried in and magnified by lovers of the New Testament for over one hundred years—shame that this book attempts to trample it underfoot!—that the Orthodox Greek Church, throughout its history, has stood like a stone wall against Rome in favor of "the teachings and practices of the New Testament" on both *baptizo* and *psallo*. And as far as the music controversy is concerned, even Thomas Aquinas of the thirteenth century, one of Rome's greatest scholars, fought instrumental music and at that time could say: "Our church does not use musical instruments, as harps and psalteries, to praise God withal, that she may not seem to Judaize." See *Bingham's Antiquities*, Volume II., page 483, *London edition*.

Thus, when we look at the facts without the footnote perversions of this book, they tell quite a different story; and hence, McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopedia* says: "The Greek word *psallo* is applied among the Greeks of modern times exclusively to sacred music, which in the Eastern Church has never been any other than vocal, instrumental

music being unknown in that church as it was in the primitive church." (Volume VIII., page 739.)

7. *Greenfield's Lexicon*. "*Psallo*, to touch, strike the strings or chords of an instrument; hence absolutely to touch or strike the chords, play on a stringed instrument; namely, as an accompaniment to the voice; by implication, to sing, and with a dative of person, to sing in honor or praise of, sing praises to, celebrate in song or psalm (Rom. 15: 9; 1 Cor. 14: 15; Eph. 5: 19; James 5: 13)."

Here again, attempting to jumble together the classical and New Testament meanings as if there were no distinction between them—a distinction which our readers can see for themselves Greenfield clearly makes—this author, with his ever handy footnote device, says: "These four texts contain all the uses of *psallo* in the New Testament. Greenfield tells us how to *psallo*, and in one united voice the world's scholarship concurs." (See page 72.) Yes, "in one united voice the world's" *very highest New Testament Greek* "scholarship concurs" with Greenfield that "all the uses of *psallo* in the New Testament" mean: "To sing, and with a dative of person, to sing in honor or praise of, sing praises to, celebrate in song or psalm." Surely we are making progress since the investigation discloses the fact that some of the author's own witnesses, in spite of his footnote device, confirm the identical doctrine for which the opposition contends.

8. *Green's Lexicon*. Now let the reader see how completely this witness, in harmony with the world's highest authority in New Testament Greek, chimes in with Greenfield in making the sharp distinction between the classic meaning and the New Testament meaning of *psallo*. Here are his words: "*Psallo*, to move by a touch, to twitch; to touch, strike the strings or chords of an instrument; absolutely to play on a stringed instrument; to sing to music; in New Testament, to sing praises (Rom. 15: 9; 1 Cor. 14: 15; Eph. 5: 19; James 5: 13): whence, *Psalmos*, impulse, touch, of the chords of a stringed instrument; in New Testament, a sacred song, psalm (1 Cor. 14: 26; Eph. 5: 19), etc."

Thus, in the case of the verb *psallo* and the noun *psalmos* he marks the change of meaning in the word, distinctly stating what it was one time in classic Greek and what it was at another time in the New Testament; but here again, on page 74, we are met again by the usual footnote attempt to break its force; but no matter how often thoughtful men read the footnote, they will still see that it does not and cannot change the fact that Green says the word means "in *New Testament* to sing praises." It would be difficult for language to be clearer or stronger.

9. *Sophocles' Lexicon*. I deeply regret the necessity here of making another exposure of tampering with an author, but the truth of God and justice to the reading public demand it. It is another case of suppressing the language of an author, and, no matter what the motive or cause of the suppression, nor whether it is an oversight or otherwise, it furnishes another incontestable proof of the utter unreliability of the book here under review. In a former chapter we saw, as was cheerfully conceded, that this man gave Sophocles' definition of the verb *psallo* without any misrepresentation, but here where the testimony of this eminent lexicon is strongly and conspicuously against him in the definition of a cognate term, he suppresses a part of Sophocles' language, precisely as we have seen he did with that of Thayer. Moreover, he suppresses the very part which would convey a different idea and teach a different doctrine from that which is conveyed and taught in his book. That English readers may see for themselves this strange perversion, I will first give word for word how this man quotes Sophocles, and then I will give word for word what Sophocles really says. On page 75 he thus quotes the illustrious Greek:

"*Psallo*, to chant, sing religious hymns."

"*Psalmos*, psalm."

"*Psaltes*, one who plays on a stringed instrument, harper."

"*Psaltoideo*, to sing to the harp."

"*Psaltos*, played upon the psaltery, sung."

Now, turning to Sophocles' lexicon, this is the way we find it:

"*Psallo, to chant, sing religious hymns.*"

"*Psalmos, psalm.*"

"*Psaltes, one who plays on a stringed instrument, harper. Classical.—2. Chanter, church-singer.*"

"*Psaltos, played upon the psaltery; sung.*"

"*Psaltoideo, to sing to the harp.*"

First of all, his transposition of Sophocles' order in the case of the last two words is immaterial, effects no change in the meaning, and I make no point on it; but, as our readers can see for themselves, while on *psallo, psalmos, psaltos* and *psaltoideo*, he quotes Sophocles' lexicon correctly, yet on *psaltes*, the very word in defining which Sophocles *draws the line between the ancient and modern meanings* and gives the vital testimony that the meaning, "one who plays on a stringed instrument, harper," is "Classical," even spelling the latter word with a capital letter, and that its later meaning, which he numbers with the figure "2" in bold-faced type, is "chanter, church-singer," this man suppresses the word "Classical," and the words, "chanter," and "church-singer," and the readers of his book, if not informed otherwise, *could never know that Sophocles had given any such valuable testimony!!* And the very words which show that instrumental music was in the ancient meaning and vocal music in the modern meaning *are suppressed!!*

But he does not stop with this suppression of the vital part of Sophocles' language, but actually follows it by saying of Sophocles that "by defining *psaltes* by 'one who plays on a stringed instrument,' any one can see that there is no escape from these three deadly parallels: Player, one who plays on an instrument; fiddler, one who fiddles on a fiddle; *psaltes*, one who *psallo (es)* on a *psalterion*." Of course "there is no escape from" the conclusion he draws when the language of Sophocles is *changed and suppressed* so as to warrant such a conclusion; but, as our readers can now see and judge for themselves, when we have before us

Sophocles' language in full and unpervverted, "there is no escape from" the conclusion that *psaltes* in "classical" Greek means "one who plays on a stringed instrument, harper," but that *later* it came to mean "chanter" and "church-singer;" and, furthermore, with all properly thoughtful persons who have all these facts before them, "there is no escape from" the further conclusion that the writer of this book, for some reason, suppresses and perverts the language of authors, and that therefore his own book is utterly unreliable.

10. *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. The definition of this eminent authority has already been given in this review. In common with the substance of the definitions of *psallo* by all other standard lexicons, he gives as one of its classical meanings, "to play on a stringed instrument;" but, as we have seen, when he comes to the New Testament, he says it means "*to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song.*"

Hence, finally, the investigation in the field of New Testament Greek lexicography, prosecuted in the third and fourth chapters and here concluded in the fifth chapter of this review, discloses the three following significant facts:

1. Among the lexicons summoned by this book as witnesses in support of instrumental music in Christian worship, ten of them, as we have now seen, distinctly testify against it and in favor of the opposition. This fact in and of itself is quite significant.

2. The attempt by the author of this book to break the force of their testimony by his copious use of footnote comments and in some instances by the actual suppression of vital parts of the lexicon's definition, is strong proof that he himself felt the force of their testimony and thus did what he could to counteract its influence.

3. The greatest, the most weighty, and at the same time the most far-reaching of all facts in the lexical line, is the fact that these ten lexicons include the very highest authority in the whole world to-day on New Testament Greek. Indeed, here is a fact, a most telling and insurmountable fact, before which even scholars, to be con-

sistent, must bow. For, well may we ask: What if a few lexicons which are inferior, yea even a great number of them, do testify against this fact, how can it really affect the issue with right-thinking people? Would it be rational for such people to turn from the *highest authority* in the world to that which is *inferior*, or to advise anybody else to do so? With all due deference to the advocates of instrumental music, I respectfully ask and would sincerely press the question for their consideration, what does it amount to if a hundred or a thousand lexicons testify in favor of it when they are all against the *very highest authority in the world on the subject*? Even if some of the lexicons and other authorities quoted by this unreliable book actually testify in defining *psallo* in favor of instrumental music in Christian worship, which they do as it represents them, instead of accepting such testimony when it is against the very highest authority in the world, we would be more consistent to explain it on prejudicial grounds precisely as we explain on such grounds similar attempts to get "sprinkle" and "pour" out of *baptizo*. And instead of attempting, in true sectarian style, to weaken the force of the position of the Orthodox Greek Church on the music question, as this untrustworthy book has vainly attempted to do, we should rather be glad to accept and to magnify the fact that, while the Roman Catholic Church has been the champion of "sprinkling" and "pouring" in the *baptizo* controversy through all the ages and for instrumental music in the *psallo* controversy, the Orthodox Greek Church, which understands and speaks and writes the Greek language, has vehemently opposed "sprinkling" and "pouring" as foreign to *baptizo* and instrumental music as foreign to *psallo*, and has consistently and tenaciously held on to immersion in the one case and to vocal music in the other.

CHAPTER VI.

THE "PSALLO" AND "BAPTIZO" CONTROVERSIES FURTHER COMPARED—MR. MORRISON'S BOOK.

It has rarely, if ever, been my lot to examine a book which contained as much unfair handling and misrepresentation of authorities as is found in the one here under review. In fact, this defect is so prominent and of such frequent occurrence in its pages that the task of exposing it has become, so far, at least, as I myself am concerned, positively distasteful, and my only reason for continuing it any further, or for any further review of the book at all, is the expressed judgment of intelligent and serious persons as explained in the opening chapter. Its suppression of the language of Thayer in the attempt to show that the great New Testament lexicographer furnishes no more proof of a change in the meaning of *psallo* than he furnishes of a change in the meaning of *baptizo*, and that of Sophocles in which were suppressed the very words of the eminent lexicographer of the Roman and Byzantine periods which mark the distinction between the classical and modern meanings of *psallo*, were duly exposed in former chapters.

Now, exactly parallel to these, and again on the meaning of *psallo* and *baptizo*, I have discovered, by making proper investigation and comparison, another case of equally gross misrepresentation. It appears in the attempt to show that my treatment of *psallo* in my book, "*Instrumental Music in the Worship*," and Mr. C. C. Morrison's treatment of *baptizo* in his book, "*The Meaning of Baptism*," are the same and lead in principle to the same result. That is, the author of this book, as we shall see, attempts in effect to make the impression that, on the same principle on which my book makes out the case that *psallo* changed from meaning *to play an instrument* in classic Greek to meaning *to sing* in the New Testament, Mr. Morrison's book makes out the case that *baptizo* changed from meaning *immerse* in classic Greek to mean-

ing *pour* and *sprinkle* in the New Testament; that my logic on *psallo* is his logic on *baptizo*; that if it sustains me on *psallo*, it sustains him on *baptizo*, and, *vice versa*, if it will not sustain him on *baptizo*, neither will it sustain me on *psallo*. He knows that practically all his readers on both sides of the music controversy will be ready to resent the thought and repudiate the position that *baptizo*, though meaning immerse in classic Greek, changed and came to mean pour and sprinkle in the New Testament, and that if he can make it appear to them that Mr. Morrison, by following my plan on *psallo*, makes out, in the same way, his case that *baptizo* once meant immerse, but changed and came to mean pour and sprinkle, then they will be equally ready to resent the thought and repudiate the position that *psallo* changed.

It must be confessed that this attempt to draw a parallel between the treatment of the two words is a rather clever and ingenious stratagem in the *psallo* controversy. Moreover, its author is so completely obsessed with it that, in one form or another, he strings it out through numerous pages over a large part of his book. In fact, although he says of me, "It is far from my purpose to review him" (page 246), yet, for some reason, he strangely finds it necessary to devote to me and to my book a very large part of the space between page 10 and page 260, with the specific mention of my name more than forty times! Perhaps I should take to myself the comfort offered by Lord Byron in "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers: "

" 'Tis pleasant, sure, to see one's name in print;
A book's a book, although there's nothing in't."

However, in the language of one of John Ray's proverbs, "It is a long lane that has no turning;" and while the proper exposure of this misleading case will require several quotations from the Morrison book, I have, nevertheless fully determined that our readers shall have the facts.

First of all, I give, in his own words, this man's representation of the case: "The position of those who hold that the meaning of *psallo* changed is the same as that of

C. C. Morrison regarding *baptizo* in his recent book, '*The Meaning of Baptism.*'" (Page 21.) Again: "Mr. Morrison's book, *The Meaning of Baptism*, but follows in the steps of *Instrumental Music in the Worship*, borrowing its plan, and building upon its deductions. Both escape the obvious meaning by having the hated word accommodat-ingly change its meaning—*psallo* in Mr. Kurfees' book; *baptizo* in Mr. Morrison's." (Pages 256, 257.) Now, while I do not know that *baptizo* is not "hated" by Mr. Morrison nor that it is, and do not see how this man can know such a -thing; yet I do know that *psallo* is not "hated" by me, notwithstanding this *generous charge!* But please note that, in his adroit statement, he does not say, in so many words, that Mr. Morrison's book holds that, just as my book claims that *psallo*, though meaning to play an instrument in classic Greek, came to mean to sing in the New Testament, so Mr. Morrison's book claims that *baptizo*, though meaning immerse in classic Greek, came to mean sprinkle or pour in the New Testament; but, nevertheless, *that is the exact impression which he attempts to make and does make upon his readers.* For aught I know, he may think that he represents Mr. Morrison's book correctly. My only point here is to make perfectly clear to our readers what it is that he represents it as teaching. Here is the proof in his own words: "If you prefer to trust the unsupported word of a man in his book, instead of the word of God in His book, that the meanings and actions of *baptizo* and *psallo* conveniently changed just before the New Testament was written, Mr. Morrison and Mr. Kurfees will accommodate you." (Page 260.) Please observe that he here says the "actions" of these words, *psallo* and *baptizo*, according to Mr. Morrison and myself, "conveniently changed." But what new "action" does he charge Mr. Morrison with attaching to *baptizo* in the New Testament? Again, his own words furnish the answer in clear and explicit terms when, on their treatment of *baptizo*, he specifically puts in the same class "Ditzler, Rice, Morrison and affusionists generally." (Page 86.) *That settles it.* "Affusion" means "pouring

upon or sprinkling" for baptism. (See Webster.) Hence, he thus tells his readers that Mr. Morrison, applying to *baptizo* my treatment of *psallo*, shows, in the same way and with the same logic, that *baptizo* changed and came to denote the "action" to *pour* or to *sprinkle* in the New Testament. Furthermore, in expatiating on this alleged parallel between my treatment of *psallo* and Mr. Morrison's treatment of *baptizo*, he attempts to add odium to my book by making an invidious comparison of its author with this "affusionist" teacher and charging that I am "making common cause with" him! "If *psallo* revolutionized to accommodate Mr. Kurfees, we dare not conclude that *baptizo* would do less to gratify Dr. Strong and Mr. Morrison." (Page 69.) "Think of Louisville linking up with Chicago! Of M. C. Kurfees making common cause with C. C. Morrison, and loaning him his *psallo* penknife (Jer. 36: 23) with which to cut *baptizo* out of the Scriptures! Yet, that is exactly what Mr. Kurfees has done." (Page 256.) Well, we shall presently see whether "that is exactly what Mr. Kurfees has done." In any event, one thing is now conclusively and definitely established—namely, this man represents Mr. Morrison's book as teaching that, just as my book teaches that *psallo* changed from meaning to play an instrument to meaning to sing, so, in the same way, Mr. Morrison's book teaches that *baptizo* changed from meaning to immerse to meaning to pour or sprinkle.

But does Mr. Morrison's book teach that *baptizo* meant immerse in classic Greek, but changed and came to mean pour and sprinkle in the New Testament? Does his book teach that pour and sprinkle are correct translations of *baptizo* in the New Testament just as my book teaches that sing is a correct translation of *psallo* in the New Testament? When I first read this representation, I had never even seen a copy of Mr. Morrison's book and knew absolutely nothing of what it contained. Hence, deciding to examine it for myself, I procured a copy and have carefully read every word of it. *There is not a solitary statement in it that says baptizo meant immerse in classic*

Greek, but changed and came to mean pour and sprinkle in the New Testament. On the contrary, we shall see that the very reverse is true to the extent that it teaches that immersion was practiced in New Testament times as the "action" expressed by *baptizo*, and that it should be practiced now. With him, the institution—the thing—called baptism is something more than either immersion, pouring, or sprinkling—something more, indeed, than any "physical act" at all. Here are his own words:

"Before the writers of the New Testament appeared on the scene the word *baptisma* was commonly used to denote the ceremony of initiation of a non-Jew into the Jewish state and church. This initiation was practiced by the total submersion of the proselyte's body in the water. At the first the word *baptisma* no doubt applied only to the physical act by which the initiation was signalized. Gradually, however, the term gathered to itself the total psychical import of the ceremony or ordinance, and was used to denote not the physical part of the ceremony alone, but the whole significance of the ceremony itself. The name of the sign had become the name of the thing signified. *Baptizo* came thus to have a technical or specialized meaning. To baptize a convert to Judaism meant thus to confer upon him the religious and political status of a Jew. The significance of the word is not rendered at all in such a context by translating it 'immerse.' The proselyte's 'baptism' was administered by immersion in water, but the baptism was not the immersion. The whole meaning of the religious ceremony had grafted itself upon the word which primarily had meant only the physical act by which the ceremony was performed." (Pages 32, 33.)

Mark the words: "*Baptizo* came thus to have," not a different "action," but, in this particular use of it, "a technical or specialized meaning" of its action. With Mr. Morrison, "the term gathered to itself" in the New Testament use of it "the total psychical import of the ceremony or ordinance, and was used to denote not the physical part of the ceremony alone," the immersion, "but the whole significance of the ceremony itself."

We will now hear Mr. Morrison's book in further detail on the subject. On page 35 he says: "There is, we repeat, no English word that satisfies" as a translation of

baptizo. On page 42 he says: "It connoted the rite of induction into the church, a rite whose essential meaning was found elsewhere than in the particular physical act by which it was solemnized." Again: "The word, however, in its New Testament usage, . . . refers primarily to the function of initiation and only incidentally to the particular physical act." (Page 48.) Still again: "Reference is here made to these lustrations of the Jews and other peoples . . . to suggest how natural it was that the particular physical act of immersion in water came to be employed as the formal sign of the baptismal act." (Page 50.)

Thus, instead of teaching that there was any such change in the word as that from immersion to classic Greek to sprinkling in the New Testament, he distinctly says "the particular physical act of immersion in water" was "employed" in that volume. Then, listen to this: "The attempt to make *baptizo* mean 'sprinkle' or 'pour' has even less ground to sustain it than had Mr. Campbell's attempt to make it mean 'immerse.'" (Page 23.) How does that statement sound in the face of the representation that Mr. Morrison's book teaches that *baptizo* changed and came to mean *sprinkle or pour*? Again: "Baptism is neither affusion nor immersion," and "any English word denoting only a physical action for the word 'baptize' involves a sacrifice of not only a part but the essential part of the meaning of the sacred text." (Page 24.) Still again, after saying on page 35, "The best reason, and the only true reason, for our English scholars not translating the word in their versions of the New Testament is that it could not be translated," he then, as if purposely to prevent the very misrepresentation in question, distinctly declares: "'Sprinkle' has not an iota of justification." Once more: "By baptism is not meant immersion, nor affusion, nor any physical act whatsoever, but the moral act of uniting oneself with those who are of like mind with oneself concerning Jesus Christ." (Page 89.) Again: "Baptism in the New Testament is not immersion at all, nor, of course, sprinkling, nor any phys-

ical act whatever, but the social and moral act of initiation into the church of Christ." (Page 206.) He calls it "the rite of initiation into the church of Christ." (Page 215.) On page 34 he says: "We have been using the word 'initiate' as the best English equivalent of this social or religious meaning of *baptizo*. This word, however, is not wholly satisfactory. It suggests to our mind somewhat more elaborate formalities than an accurate translation should convey. 'Induct' is in this respect a better word. We have no single English word that expresses with complete precision the meaning of the Jewish use of *baptizo* at the time of John. Our difficulty is all the more marked when we come to the term in its full Christian signification." But when we "come to the term in its full Christian signification," he distinctly teaches in so many words that immersion was the "action:" "Under Paul's hand, immersion received a specific and distinctive symbolism. . . . 'We are buried with him in baptism into his death, that like as Christ was raised up by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.' This imagery was suggested to Paul, without doubt, by the act of immersion in water by which the ceremony of baptism was administered. . . . 'This very immersion,' he would say, 'shows forth the Lord's death, burial and resurrection. That he died and was buried is pictured by your burial in the watery grave; that he arose again from the dead is symbolized by your being raised again from the water.' In this way Paul made of immersion a monument to the great facts of historic Christianity." (Pages 179-181.) Again: "Regularity in the administration of the rite of initiation into the church of Christ—historical regularity, dating back to apostolic practice—demands that the candidate be baptized by immersion in water." (Page 215.)

But does not Mr. Morrison teach in his book that baptism or "the rite of initiation into the church of Christ" may be performed, as among the Presbyterians, by pouring and sprinkling? Yes, he does; but on the same page, 215, he distinctly says of such a "baptism" that "it was

irregularly performed," and not that *baptizo* had come to denote that "action," and the italics are his own. Again, so far is he from teaching that *baptizo* changed from immerse in classic Greek to sprinkle in the New Testament, that he not only says, as we have seen, that immersion was practiced in New Testament times and should be practiced now, but he distinctly *counsels against substituting sprinkling or any other "action" for immersion*, in these words: "Immersion is seen to possess a dignity and richness of content which should give pause to the church that would substitute anything else for it." (Page 195.)

To sum up the whole argument, instead of Mr. Morrison's book teaching that *baptizo* "revolutionized" from meaning immerse in classic Greek to meaning sprinkle in the New Testament, just as my book teaches that *psallo* "revolutionized" from meaning to play an instrument in classic Greek to meaning to sing in the New Testament, and instead of using my "*psallo* penknife" or any other instrument "with which to cut *baptizo* out of the Scriptures," he both leaves *baptizo* in "the Scriptures" and distinctly declares that the "action" therein expressed by the word is *immersion*: "The particular physical act of immersion came to be employed;" "under Paul's hand immersion received a specific and distinctive symbolism;" "that he died and was buried is pictured by your burial in the watery grave, that he arose from the dead is symbolized by your being raised again from the water;" "regularity in the administration of the rite . . . demands that the candidate be baptized by immersion in water;" and "sprinkle has not an iota of justification." Was there ever a more complete misrepresentation of a book than these facts disclose?

Now, I do not believe Mr. Morrison's doctrine about "the social and moral act" of baptism (page 206); that "it is not a physical act" at all (page 89); that it may be "validly solemnized by other forms than immersion" (page 88); and that those who received sprinkling were "baptized," only "it was *irregularly performed*" (page 215)—I do not believe, according to the New Testament,

that they were baptized at all; and much else that he teaches on baptism I do not believe; but, nevertheless, my disagreement with him on all these points, or on any other points, has nothing whatever to do with the fact that he does *not* teach, as represented by the book here under review, that *baptizo* meant immerse in classic Greek, but changed and came to mean sprinkle in the New Testament. The purpose of representing the Morrison book as getting *pour* and *sprinkle* out of *baptizo* by following exactly the same plan that my book follows in getting *sing* out of *psallo* is to make the latter, like the former, odious to the readers. But the author of this representation should have taken time to consider the fact that, even if Mr. Morrison or any one else should attempt to draw such a parallel by claiming that the "action" of *baptizo*, like that of *psallo*, changed and came to mean *sprinkle* just as the former changed and came to mean *sing*, there is *proof* for the change in *psallo*, already presented in this review, that no living man can produce in favor of a change in the "action" of *baptizo*. But, as the case really stands, there is not only no attempt in the Morrison book to show any such change in the "action" of *baptizo*, but there is not even the claim that there is any such change. Hence, not only would the argument, even if founded on a real attempt to draw such a parallel, be worth nothing, but, in this particular case, it does not even have the merit of resting on a correct representation of the facts, and, therefore, both the representation and the argument built on it utterly fall to the ground.

Hence, finally, no matter how honest and sincere the author of the representation may be in making it, nor whether it be the result of misinformation or what not, that has nothing whatever to do with the fact that the representation, not being correct, is incontestable proof that any other representations in the book here under review, unless otherwise known to be correct, are untrustworthy, and that, therefore, the book itself is unreliable.

CHAPTER VII.

THE PASSAGE FROM LUCIAN.

In accordance with my promise in the early part of this review, I now propose a careful examination of the famous passage from Lucian. It is proper to say, however, at the very beginning, that this examination is by no means called for because the passage itself, in its essential meaning and from the Christian point of view, has any decisive bearing whatever upon the *psallo* controversy, for, as we shall see from the facts in the case, it has absolutely no such bearing at all; but it is deemed proper to give the attention to it that is here proposed because of the great ado made over it and the misleading application made of it in the book here under review. This ado is not only begun by a conspicuous display of the passage on the title-page, but it is continued by numerous and repeated displays of it in the body of the book on pages 66, 135, 139, 140, 142, 167, 178, 253, 278, 286, 287, 305, 316, and 318, and thus it is paraded through fourteen pages besides the title-page. In fact, the author of the book seems to think that the little squib from the Grecian satirist contains a veritable mine of logical wealth, a regular bonanza for the instrumental-music cause; but, like many other things in the book, all that its incorrect and misleading application needs in order to change the situation radically is to appeal to the facts and turn on the light.

Hence, over against this conspicuous ado made about the passage, I unhesitatingly affirm that, so far as the matter of support for instrumental music in Christian worship is concerned, there is absolutely not a solitary thing in it, and I now propose to go to the bottom of it and to demonstrate this fact to any fair-minded person who is capable of sound reasoning and who will properly weigh all testimony in the case. As a matter of fact, when we come to see the real teaching of the passage, this ado over it will not only be seen in its true light, but every vestige of

what even appeared, by misapplication, to be an argument for the instrumental-music cause will vanish into nothing.

That our readers may appreciate the criticism here to be made, they should know something about who Lucian is, and particularly his thorough knowledge of the Greek language and his unquestioned ability to write that language correctly. I shall, therefore, first of all, introduce him to them both in his capacity as a Greek scholar and in his attitude toward Christianity. As one of the keenest wits and probably the greatest satirist in all Greek literature, if he could see the novel interpretation put upon his little Greek sentence containing *psallo* and the changes rung on it as a weapon in support of a theological tenet in the numerous pages just cited, he would probably furnish the world with another rare specimen of ridicule, if not, indeed, of biting sarcasm.

The time of Lucian is usually placed between A.D. 120 and A.D. 180. He was born at Samosata, modern name Samsat, a city on the Euphrates in Northern Syria. By mistake he is sometimes confused with another Lucian, the eminent Christian martyr of the same name and born in the same city, but who lived in the fourth century A.D. The latter also is said to have possessed great learning; and, rather than surrender his faith and convictions, he courageously suffered martyrdom by hunger and torture under the Emperor Maximin Daza.

Concerning the Lucian of our passage, I now submit the testimony of leading authorities. *The New International Encyclopedia* says:

"Of Lucian as a literary artist, there can be but one opinion. He is one of the world's greatest writers of prose. His Greek syntax will not bear the microscope of the professional grammarian, but for literary purposes, he writes correct enough Attic. His command of the resources of what was to him a dead language is amazing. He has every word and phrase of Plato, Aristophanes, and Demosthenes at his pen's end, and for purposes of literary allusion, is master of all Greek literature and history." (Volume XIV., page 445.)

The *Encyclopedia Britannica* says:

"As a satirist and a wit, Lucian occupies in prose literature the unique position which Aristophanes holds in Greek poetry; but whether he is a mere satirist, who laughs while he lashes, or a misanthrope, who hates while he derides, is not very clear. In favor of the former view, it may be said that the two main objects of his ridicule are mythology and the sects of philosophy; in favor of the latter, his bitter exposure of imposture and chicanery in the *Alexander* and the very severe attacks he makes on the 'humbug' of philosophy, which he everywhere assails with acrimonious and contemptuous epithets.

"As a writer, Lucian is fluent, easy and unaffected, and a close follower of the best Attic models, such as Plato and the orators. His style is simpler than Plutarch's, and some of his compositions, especially the *Dialogues of the Gods* (pages 204-287) and of the *Marine Deities* (288-327), and, above all, the *Dialogues of the Dead* (329-454), are models of witty, polished and accurate Greek composition. . . . Lucian evinces a perfect mastery over a language as wonderful in its inflections as in its immense and varied vocabulary; and it is a well-merited praise of the author to say that to a good Greek scholar, the pages of Lucian are almost as easy and as entertaining as an English or French novel. It is true that he employs some forms and compounds which were not in use in the time of Plato or Demosthenes, and, as one who lived under Roman rule, has a tendency toward Latinisms." (Volume XVII., page 101.)

Thus, the reader can see that, in the estimation of scholars, Lucian occupies a high place in the sphere of Greek learning. It is true that his "Greek syntax" is sometimes discounted, and he employs "forms and compounds which were not in use in the time of Plato or Demosthenes," but this is certainly no argument against his learning. It is only about three hundred years from Shakespeare's time to ours, and yet within that time many radical changes in "forms and compounds" have taken place in the English language; but there were five hundred years between Plato and Lucian, and of course there would be many changes in the language within that time. Hence, such variations in Lucian from the Attic models have no weight

against the claim that he was master of the Greek language.

That our conception of him may be complete, I present also his attitude toward Christianity. He was not only not a Christian, but he was decidedly anti-Christian. In fact, he was a skeptic and not even a believer in a future state of existence. *The Encyclopedia Britannica* says:

"Lucian was not only a skeptic; he was a scoffer and a downright unbeliever. He felt that men's actions and conduct always fall far short of their professions, and therefore he concluded that the professions themselves were worthless, and a mere guise to secure popularity and respect. Of Christianity, he shows some knowledge, and it must have been somewhat largely professed in Syria at the close of the second century." (Volume XVII., page 100.)

The Americana says:

"The Christian religion, of which, however, he knew little, and that only through the medium of mysticism, was an object of his ridicule. His writings were once largely studied as textbooks, but his diction is not the best." (Volume XVII., page 717.)

The Encyclopedia Britannica further says:

"The sarcasms on the popular mythology, the conversations of Plato, Hermes, Charon and others of the powers in Hades, show a positive disbelief in any future state of existence." (Volume XVII., page 101.)

Thus, while Lucian had no sympathy with Christianity and we may not expect anything from him in direct elucidation of any of its tenets, he was, nevertheless, an accurate writer of the Greek language, and we may be sure that he would never use such a sentence as that in the passage in question, with the remotest thought of the anomalous construction placed upon it by the book here under review. For the benefit of those who read the original, but have not access to Lucian's works, I here transliterate the passage, word for word, as it is in the Greek of Lucian's *Parasite* 17:

"*Kai hai men allai technai chooris organoon oudamoos tooi kekteenenooi hypeeretein dynantai; oute gar aulein eni chooris auloon, oute psallein aneu lyras, oute hippeuein chooris hippou.*"

It may be rendered as follows: "And the other arts are by no means able, apart from instruments, to be of service to their possessor; for neither is it possible to play a flute apart from flutes, nor to make music without a musical instrument, nor to ride horseback apart from a horse."

The reader will please note that I render *psallo* in this passage "to make music" and *lyra* "a musical instrument." There is, as we shall see, the best of reasons for this rendering in this particular context. In fact, to render the former "to play the lyre" in this passage, as is done in the book here under review (page 139), does not correctly represent *psallo* unless, as we shall see further on, we attach to "lyre" the general meaning of "stringed or musical instrument." It cannot possibly be otherwise, for the simple reason, as we absolutely know, it is possible to *psallein* without a lyre. It is possible to *psallein* with any other stringed or musical instrument; and therefore, so far as the meaning and translation of *psallo* are concerned, instead of translating it here "to play the lyre," we may well ask, why not translate it "to play the *cithara*," "to play the *phorminx*," "to play the *magadis*," etc.? It meant all of these and more, too. Moreover, if Lucian had in his mind *playing the lyre*, and meant that, the verb *lurizo* was at hand and is the very verb to use to convey that idea. If that is what he meant, why did he not use that term? There is simply no escape here. Lucian either meant more than *playing the lyre*, or he did not know what word to use, one or the other. But, being the master of the Greek language that he was, his failure to use *lurizo* is positive proof that he meant more than *playing the lyre*; and this fact, in turn, becomes indirect proof that *lyra*, in this particular passage, means more than the one instrument so called. Hence, instead of limiting *psallo* to the lyre in translating it here, to which we know it was never limited in any period of its history,

it should be rendered in terms which include everything and exclude nothing that is essential to its meaning, and the rendering, "make music," does this in this particular context. When, therefore, we construe *lyra*, in this passage, to represent, not merely the instrument so called, but *stringed or musical instruments in general*, then the passage makes sense and states what is absolutely a fact—namely, "it is impossible to make music without a musical instrument." In order that the passage may state the truth in English, we are simply forced to the alternative of either limiting *psallo* to playing the lyre or to some other single instrument, to which we know it was not limited among the Greeks, or of extending *lyra*, in this particular context, to represent stringed or musical instruments in general; and I know of no authority for the former, but for the principle at least that is involved in the latter, Liddell and Scott, under the term *kitharizo*, distinctly say: "There can have been no great difference between the *kithara*, *lyra*, and *phorminx*." Hence, beyond any reasonable doubt, the rendering here given is a correct English statement of the idea in the Lucian passage.

We are now ready for a careful consideration of two questions which, I think, will put the teaching of the passage beyond all doubt. These questions are: (1) *What does the Lucian passage literally say?* (2) *What does it mean to teach?* In answering these questions, the purpose is to be guided by what the laws of language demand, and not by the theological or religious opinions of anybody; and hence, to such a line of investigation the reader's attention is now invited.

1. *What does the Lucian passage literally say?* The answer to this question is ready at hand. Leaving the two principal words of the passage untranslated, here is what it *literally says*: "It is impossible to *psallein* without a *lyra*." Never mind just now about the meaning of either *psallein* or *lyra*. What the passage literally says is that it is impossible to do what *the one signifies* without what *the other signifies*. Hence, no matter what *psallein* means, and no matter what *lyra* means, Lucian *literally says* it is

impossible to do the former without the latter. Mark you, he does not say that whatever *psallein* denotes, it cannot *well or easily* be done without what *lyra* denotes, but he says it is *impossible to do it—it simply cannot be done*. This, with absolutely no room for doubt or dispute at all, is exactly what the passage *literally* says.

2. *What does it mean or teach?* If some one asks, "Does it not mean and teach what it says?" I reply, yes, it means and teaches exactly what it says when we construe its terms according to the laws of language; but, according to these laws, the meaning of no statement can be restricted to its literal import if there are other facts either in the context or elsewhere which *indicate and necessitate* a broader import. For example, John calls Jesus a "lamb" (John 1: 29), and Jesus calls Herod a "fox" (Luke 13: 32); but what is a *lamb*, and what is a *fox*? Literally each is a member of the quadruped species of animal; but was either Jesus or Herod *that*? All who are competent to judge of such matters know they were not; and yet Jesus *was* a lamb and Herod *was* a fox—that is, each was *figuratively* what is stated. Of course Jesus was not *literally* a lamb, and Herod was not *literally* a fox.

Now, on the same principle, as we have seen, Lucian *literally* says: "It is impossible to *psallein* without a *lyra*;" but is that *literally* so? Whoever answers "Yes" has Lucian teaching that "it is impossible to *psallein*" *with any other stringed instrument except a lyra*! Is any thoughtful person prepared for this? There were numerous other stringed instruments of music among the Greeks, all mentioned and defined by Liddell and Scott. There were the *kithara* and *phorminx* with seven strings each, the *kinura* and *nabla* with ten strings each, the *magadis* with twenty strings, the *sambukee*, a trangular musical instrument with four strings, besides the *barbitos*, the *phoinix*, and the *psalterion*, all stringed instruments of music; and yet Lucian, according to this hard and fast construction of his words, tells us "it is impossible to *psallein*" *with any of them except the lyra*!! I repeat, is any thoughtful person prepared for this—prepared to

accept such an absurd construction of his language? The fact that it makes him diametrically contradict what we know to be *facts* is positive proof that he meant no such thing. Hence, as the case stands, he no more meant "lyre," except in the fact that it was a *stringed or musical instrument*, than John and Jesus meant "lamb" and "fox," except in the fact that they represent *certain qualities*. The context not only justifies but demands this construction and forbids any other. He is writing about what it is *impossible* to do with *aulein*, *hippeuein*, and *psallein*. In substance, he tells us, "It is impossible to *aulein* without an *aulos*, it is impossible to *hippeuein* without a *hippos*, and it is impossible to *psallein* without a *lyra*;" but, according to the facts now before us and the linguistic principle here involved, "*lyra*" or *lyre*, in this passage, does not merely suggest or stand for itself alone, but for *any instrument* at all with which *psalloing* can be done. This is either true, or, as we have seen, Lucian is made to say that it is impossible to *psallein* with any instrument except a lyre; and I respectfully add that I do not think any one who understands the Lucian passage and its context, either in the original or in an English translation, will call this statement in question. In fact, any intelligent person, without any knowledge of the original at all, knows that if Lucian knew what he was writing about and had respect for the truth, he would not be guilty of making the absurd statement that it is *impossible to psallein except with one particular stringed instrument*.

Hence, by every principle involved in the construction of language, we are forced to the conclusion that what is taught and all that is taught by Lucian's language is that "it is impossible to *psallein* without" *an instrument or object with which or on which to psallein*; but the moment we take this position, to which, as we have seen, all the laws of language here involved force us, then the additional conclusion is also inevitable—namely, that the instrument with which or on which the *psalloing* is done may be *one thing*, or it may be *any other thing* among all

the things with which or on which it is *possible* to *psallein*. But, according to the history of *psallo*, covering a period of five hundred years, as we saw in Chapter III. of this review, it was possible, during that period, to *psallein* with "the hair," with "a bowstring," with "a carpenter's line," with any sort of "musical instrument" made with human hands, and finally with "the heart" in song. Now, let the reader note the significant and telling fact that, as Lucian, according to the principles of language now before us, does not restrict the matter of *psalloing* either to the lyre, which he mentions, or to any other *one* instrument or object to the exclusion of others, but merely says, in principle, that "it is impossible to *psallein* without" *some* instrument or object with which or on which it may be done, it follows, as clearly as a mathematical demonstration, that his little sentence, after all the ado made about it, does not determine nor even touch the question whether the object or instrument used in *psalloing* shall be one thing or another—whether it shall be the hair, a bowstring, a carpenter's line, a musical instrument made with human hands, or the human heart. (I assume in my translation, and think the context demands it, that he meant music of one kind or the other.) *His passage does not directly say a solitary word on this point.* He merely affirms that "it is impossible to *psallein* without" *something* with which to *psallein*; and this is just as true of *psallo* in the New Testament as it was at any time during the Classical Period. And as to *psallo* in the New Testament, it is an unanswerable fact that it definitely specifies "the heart" as the instrument with which *psalloing* is to be done. See Eph. 5: 19, especially in the original.

Hence, by the cumulative force of indisputable facts we are led to the inevitable conclusion that the famous passage in question not only does not determine, but it does not even touch the question as to whether instrumental or vocal music is signified by the term *psallo* in its general usage at that time. However, it is the purpose to consider, in another place in this review, the bearing which it may be thought the passage has on this particular point.

But be this as it may, it is still a fact that even if it can be shown, beyond all question, on which point I here neither affirm nor deny, that instrumental music is what he had in mind and meant in this passage, which is wholly immaterial to the one issue here before us, yet, it determines nothing about the *particular instrument* with which *psal-loing* is done in the New Testament, whether with the human heart, as in song, or with an instrument made by human hands, as in instrumental music, it being a demonstrated fact, as we have seen, that all the passage says is that it is impossible to *psallein* without *some* instrument with which or on which to *psallein*, just as in "the other arts" it is impossible for them "apart from instruments to be of service." Thus, of the correctness of this construction, Lucian himself furnishes incontestable proof in the immediate context of the passage, saying, "The other arts are by no means able, apart from instruments, to be of service to their possessor," and he illustrates with playing a flute and riding horseback, saying: "Neither is it possible to play a flute apart from flutes, . . . nor to ride horseback apart from a horse."

But this brings us to another significant fact which must not be overlooked—namely, he did *not* say, "Neither is it possible to *play* apart from flutes, . . . nor to *ride* apart from a horse," for neither of these statements would be true. Furthermore, it is significant that he did *not* say, although *verbal parallelism* would have required him to say, "It is impossible to *psallein* without a *psalterion*." And why did he not say this? Why not use *psalterion*, the noun cognate to *psallo*, just as, in the other two illustrations, he used *aulos* (flute) and *hippos* (horse), the nouns cognate to *auleoo* and *hippeuoo*? Because he not only understood the Greek language, but also the principles of rhetoric in writing it; and since he was using, in the same context, two other sentences each with a noun cognate to its verb and calling for a *literal* construction, to use, in a third sentence, the noun cognate to its verb would appear to call for the *same construction*; but *psallo* being the verb he wished to use and did use, if he should

use its cognate noun *psalterion* and say, "It is impossible to *psallein* without a *psalterion*," he knew he would be saying what is not true, unless a *figurative* construction were placed upon *psalterion*, making it mean, in that particular passage, not merely the instrument so called, but *any* instrument with which it is possible to *psallein*; but being compelled, in using with *psallo* any term denoting a single instrument, to use the said term *figuratively* so that it would stand, in that particular place, not for itself alone, but for *any instrument* with which *psalloing* might be done, he wisely avoided the cognate noun in this case and chose *lyra*, which, in such a verbal environment, would be less liable to be construed as meant by the author to stand for itself alone.

Finally, the poet Ovid said he would "sing of facts" even though some might say he "invented them;" and whether we sing of them or not, the facts which are now before us show, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that Lucian's language merely means, in principle, that it is impossible to *psallein* without *some* instrument with which to *psallein*, and therefore his little sentence does not determine whether that instrument shall *necessarily* be *one thing* or *another*, and this fact completely takes the passage away from those who attempt to use it to bolster the instrumental-music cause. He was merely contending for a practical truth which he saw everywhere exemplified in the different arts, and says nothing directly for or against either side of the music controversy.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE CASE OF ALEXANDRIA, WITH MORE MISREPRESENTATION OF AUTHORITIES.

In Chapter VI. of this review I gave free expression to the decided distaste which I had formed for the unpleasant work of exposing the misrepresentation of authorities so

frequently found in the book here under examination; and if our readers do not already share with me the same feeling, they will doubtless have it in full measure when the things to be exposed in the present chapter are laid bare. I regret the unpleasant duty, but a widespread and pressing call from intelligent men and women has placed it upon me, and I am striving to discharge it faithfully and in the fear of God.

On pages 124-134 of my book, "Instrumental Music in the Worship," I presented the case of Clement of Alexandria, the purpose of which was to meet and refute the claim sometimes made by the advocates of instrumental music in divine worship, that "even as early as the close of the second century"—the time of Clement—it was thus used, and was used under the sanction of Clement himself. Of course, even if such position were established beyond doubt, the case would still fall short of sanction by divine inspiration; but the inconclusiveness of the claim, with its utter lack of support in the records of either Clement or of others of that period, is fully set forth in the pages of my book just cited, and not a solitary thing to the contrary is adduced in the attempted reply in the book here under review, except, as we shall see, at the expense of *changing the record*. The author of this strange book seems to have been wholly oblivious to the thought that his tampering with records could ever be exposed and rendered ridiculous as well as otherwise improper in the estimation of all right-thinking people who might see it. Moreover, candor compels me to concede that persons who have not read my book nor the works of Clement, and who have any reason to believe that this man is stating facts in his book as they really are in Clement and elsewhere, will, of course, most likely conclude that my statement of the case is not sustained by the facts. I do not see how they could properly draw any other conclusion from the premises which he constructs.

But, not only justice demands, but our readers are otherwise entitled to know, that the premises, in this attempt at refutation, are formed, not only by attributing to me

what I never did either in my book or anywhere else, but by putting into the record statements which Clement did not make and leaving out statements which he did make. As to the correctness of this statement, our readers can examine the facts for themselves and draw their own conclusion. As it sheds a ray of light on the situation, I will first lay before them his significant comment upon the case. Referring to the chapter from Clement, he says:

"I was not prepared to believe that one so sensible as Mr. Kurfees would set for himself and his followers such a cruel trap as this chapter proved to be when the Greek text was consulted. . . . Mr. Kurfees translates *psallein* by 'play.' As there is no gainsaying the fact that he is the acknowledged authority of those who oppose the instrument, and notably of those who say *psallo* ceased to indicate an instrument, and as I have now completely proven by Mr. Kurfees, the Greek scholar, that Mr. Kurfees, the theologian, is in error, the latter's admiring lesser lights should abandon the theologian, swear allegiance to the scholar and promptly yield the pretension that in the New Testament times *psallo* meant 'to sing unaccompanied.' In the short chapter of four pages published by Mr. Kurfees, Clement eighteen times employs *psallein* in the varying forms, to refer to the instrument, and in ten of the eighteen instances, Mr. Kurfees translates the word as indicating an instrument!! or its function, while in one of the examples, he renders it 'praise,' and in but three of the eighteen times does he render *psallein* by 'voice' or 'sing.' Talk about Homer sometimes nodding! If the general staff, with headquarters at Nashville, which stationed this soldier of the cross on sentry duty to guard this critical portion of the fighting line, should enforce military law, he would be court-martialed for snoring at noon-tide within hearing distance of the enemy listening posts. . . . There are several other instances wherein our Homer nodded, while writing *Instrumental Music in the Worship*, as I would show were I writing a refutation. . . . What must be said of a writer whose book contains dozens of examples where he renders *psallein* 'to play,' and then fills that book with the most positive assertions that there are no such examples?" (Pages 250-254.)

Well, it was Horace, the famous Roman poet, who said,

"Even the worthy Homer sometimes nods;"

but it was Alexander Pope, the brilliant English poet, who said,

"Those oft are stratagems which errors seem,
Nor is it Homer nods, but we that dream;"

and, in view of the several statements in the foregoing extract which our readers will be able to see for themselves are distinctly incorrect, I merely add, in this connection, that, when all the facts are in, I shall be perfectly willing for intelligent and impartial readers to decide whether, in the present instance, "our Homer nodded" and was found "snoring at noontide," or his critic was found resorting to "stratagems" or to something else. I have every needed facility for stating the case accurately; for, in addition to having at hand a copy of the book here under review and a copy of the English translation of the "Ante-Nicene Fathers," I have also the words of Clement in the original Greek. Moreover, although I carefully read the works of Clement before writing my book, yet, before writing the present criticism, I carefully went over every word of the famous chapter of Clement in the original, and the reader can rely upon my statement both as to the occurrences of *psallo* in that chapter and as to quotations and comparisons now to be made. I shall give, word for word, what the author of this book says, and then place beside it, word for word, how the same matters are given in Clement. He heads his chapter, "Put to Rout by his Own Testimony;" but I will let our readers see the method by which and the extent to which I have been "put to rout."

1. Turning to page 250 of the book here under review, after referring his readers to "Clement of Alexandria, Paed. IV., II (*Inst. Mus. in Wor. p. 127f.*)," thus specifying the pages in my book which contain the "Ante-Nicene Fathers" translation of Clement from which he professes to quote, the following is the way he quotes it:

"The Spirit distinguishing from such revelry the divine service sings to the harp strings [*psallei*]. 'Praise Him with the sound of trumpet;' for with sound of trumpet, He shall raise the dead."

Now, if our readers will turn to my book, pages 127-131, they will find *verbatim*, and in full, Chapter IV. of Book II. of Clement's work entitled "The Instructor," and they will find on page 129 that the foregoing passage is as follows:

"The Spirit, distinguishing from such revelry the divine service, sings, 'Praise Him with the sound of trumpet;' for with sound of trumpet he shall raise the dead."

Thus, the phrase, "to the harp strings," is not in the Clement passage at all, *but was added by this man!* Not only so, but he also changed the punctuation. The passage says: "The Spirit . . . sings, 'Praise Him with the sound of trumpet,'" thus putting a comma after "sings" and showing that *what they were to sing* is "praise Him with the sound of trumpet;" whereas this man adds the phrase, "to the harp strings," and follows it with a period or full stop, as if the sentence next following did not express *what they were to sing*, but something different and entirely independent! In other words, he puts into the testimony of my witness what my witness *did not say*, and this is the way I am "put to rout by" my "own testimony"! If it be said that he was merely giving what he conceived to be the meaning of *psallo* in that passage, that will not help his case in the least; for he was not *translating* Clement, but *quoting* Clement as given in the "Ante-Nicene Fathers" translation, and to which he himself gave specific reference. The significant fact here is, which our readers can verify for themselves by turning to the Clement chapter in my book, to which he refers and from which he quotes, *he simply added a phrase of his own invention which is not in the passage at all.*

2. Again, on page 251, here is the way he quotes another passage from Clement:

"And as it is befitting before partaking of food that we should bless the Creator of all, so also in drinking it is suitable to praise Him with the harp [*psallein*] on partaking of his creatures."

But here is the way the passage reads in Clement:

"And as it is befitting, before partaking of food, that we should bless the Creator of all; so also in drinking it is suitable to praise Him on partaking of his creatures."

Thus, in this case also, he changes the record by adding the phrase, "with the harp," *which is not in the text!* He seems to have no hesitancy in adding to the text that which will make it teach what he wants it to teach.

3. On page 253, referring to "examples of *psallo* involving or implying the use of an instrument," he says:

"We frequently find *examples in pairs*, sometimes by the dozen, while in the case of Athenæus, Plutarch, and Clement, they occur *by the score*. In the four pages from the latter, Mr. Kurfees gives eighteen."

Now, that statement is absolutely incorrect, and I respectfully reply that "Mr. Kurfees" not only "gives" no such number, but *psallo* does not even occur that often in the entire chapter from Clement. On the contrary, in the whole chapter, including all the different grammatical forms of the term, *psallo* occurs only six times. Its cognate terms, *psalteerion* and *psalmos*, occur, the former seven times and the latter four times, while the latter occurs one time in combination with another word (*psalmodia*). Hence, to me, too, there really seemed to be "a cruel trap" here "when the Greek text was consulted;" but I leave it to our readers to decide *who is in the trap*, in view of the fact that this man either did not know our illustrious friend *psallo* well enough to distinguish him from his "verbal kinsfolks," or he contradicted the facts in the case for some other reason, one or the other. In either case, the circumstance is another complete and convincing demonstration of the utter unreliability of this book even when it undertakes to tell whether *psallo* is in a Greek passage or not.

4. He not only says, "Mr. Kurfees translates *psallein* by 'play,'" but that "in the short chapter of four pages published by Mr. Kurfees, Clement eighteen times employs *psallein*, in the varying forms, to refer to the instrument,

and in ten of the eighteen instances, Mr. Kurfees translates the word as indicating an instrument!!" (Pages 252, 253.) Thus, *two exclamation points* are used to intensify astonishment that I would be guilty of such an inconsistent thing, and I agree that there is ground for astonishment in this connection. First of all, his figment about the "eighteen" instances of *psallo* in the chapter has already been exposed; and as to the rest of the statement, it is not only *not* true that "Mr. Kurfees translates *psallein* by 'play,'" and that "in ten of the eighteen instances, Mr. Kurfees translates the word as indicating an instrument," but, as a matter of fact, throughout the entire chapter from Clement, *I do not translate the word at all, except one time, and there I translate it "make melody,"* just as it is translated in the Authorized and Revised Versions of the New Testament in Eph. 5: 19. Our readers can verify this by consulting pages 124-131 of my book, where the plain English statement of the case will show that I did not translate the word in that whole chapter except the one time; and even in the one exception I did not translate it in the way he attributes to me. On the contrary, on page 127 I distinctly and specifically say: "We submit the English translation given in Volume II. of the 'Ante-Nicene Fathers' under the editorship of Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson and styled the 'American Reprint of the Edinburgh Edition.'" Hence, in the case of every occurrence of the word in the entire chapter, with the one exception named, it is the "Ante-Nicene Fathers" translation and not mine. And yet he asks: "What must be said of a writer whose book contains dozens of examples where he renders *psallein* 'to play' and then fills that book with the most positive assertions that there are no such examples?" I respectfully reply: "What must be said of a writer" who says "Clement eighteen times employs *psallein*," when Clement employs it only *six times*, and who says "in ten of the eighteen instances, Mr. Kurfees translates the word as indicating an instrument," whereas "Mr. Kurfees" translates

it only *one time*, and then not as that writer represents him?

5. By careful investigation and comparison, another significant fact, which was intimated in a preceding paragraph, is here brought to light. Not only did the author of this book, as we have seen, add things in favor of instrumental music which Clement did not say, *but he omitted the very things which Clement did say and which distinctly show that he was against the use of instrumental music in the worship.* Here they are: "If people occupy their time with pipes, and psalteries, and choirs, and dances, and Egyptian clapping of hands, and such disorderly frivolities, they become quite immodest and intractable, beat on cymbals and drums, and make a noise on instruments of delusion." Mark you, he calls them "instruments of delusion." Again: "Let the pipe be resigned to the shepherds, and the flute to the superstitious who are engrossed in idolatry. For, in truth, such instruments are to be banished from the temperate banquet, being more suitable to beasts than to men, and the more irrational portion of mankind." Of course, if they "are to be banished from temperate banquets," they would have to be "banished" from the assembly for divine worship. Again, where Clement says things which he knew might be construed as *favoring* instrumental music in the worship, he is careful to explain that he did not mean *that*, thus: "'Praise him on the chords and organ.' Our body he calls an organ, and its nerves are the strings by which it has received harmonious tension, and when struck by the Spirit, it gives forth human voices." Again: "'Praise Him on the clashing cymbals.' He calls the tongue the cymbal of the mouth, which resounds with the pulsation of the lips." Again: "For man is truly a pacific instrument; while other instruments, if you investigate, you will find to be warlike, inflaming to lust, or kindling up amours or rousing wrath." And he adds: "The one instrument of peace, the word alone by which we honor God, is what we employ." Then, finally, as if to put the matter beyond all dispute, he adds: "We no longer employ the ancient

psaltery and trumpet, and timbrel, and flute, which those expert in war and contemnners of the fear of God were wont to make use of also in choruses at their festive assemblies; that by such strains they might raise their dejected minds." (*"Ante-Nicene Fathers,"* Volume II., pages 248, 249; or *"Instrumental Music in the Worship,"* pages 127-131.)

Now, I respectfully ask, are not such disclosures sad to contemplate, and are they not sufficient to impress serious and thoughtful persons? The readers of his book, if not otherwise informed, *could never know that Clement said any such things.* And yet, in spite of such omissions and misrepresentations, the author of this book talks of "Homer sometimes nodding"! But, so far as I am concerned, while I am decidedly against both, yet I am frank to say that, were I forced to choose between such "stratagems" in dealing with authors, and both "nodding" and "snoring at noontide within hearing distance of the enemy listening posts," I would promptly choose the latter.

6. As to the use of *psallo* in Clement or elsewhere "to refer to the instrument" or "as indicating an instrument," as the author of this book expresses it, page 253, in all such cases, the idea of instrumental music is conveyed by *other terms* and not by *psallo*. Moreover, there is nothing in the position defended in this review in the chapters on "the function and authority of lexicons" that is inconsistent with such use of the term *psallo*; but be it remembered, that when it is so used, the idea of instrumental music is indicated, as just stated, and does not inhere in *psallo* itself. To illustrate this point, citing the original of the Clement chapter, it is so used in 37 in the form *psallein*, but it has both *kithara* and *lyra* with which the *psalloing* is done, and it is *by them* and *not by psallo* that the idea of instrumental music is indicated. Again, it is so used in 38 in the form *psalate*, but it has *psalteerion* to indicate instrumental music; and still again it is so used in 44 in the form *psallatoosan*, but it has both *tympanon* and *psalteerion* to indicate instrumental music. The *tympanon* was a kind of drum, and *psallo*, as we have

seen, means to *strike*, and this is a most natural application of its original and literal import. But in 26, where it occurs in the form *psallei*, but where there is no such object or instrument used in connection with it, the eminent authors of the "Ante-Nicene Fathers" translation properly render it *sing*, saying, "the Spirit . . . sings." The same work, commenting in a footnote on 37, where *psallein* is used with *kithara* and *lyra*, says: "Here instrumental music is allowed, though he turns everything into a type." The thought conveyed by this sentence, apparently favoring instrumental music, is what has led scholars, as shown in my book, to regard the passage as spurious, because Clement, as we have seen from his own positive statements in other parts of the chapter, strongly opposed instrumental music in the worship; and if he favored it in this passage or elsewhere, he contradicted himself.

7. Finally, I close this chapter with an additional word concerning the inherent meaning of the word *psallo*. The radical and primary meaning of the term has been fully set forth in previous chapters, and it has been abundantly established, according to the highest lexical authorities, that neither in Clement nor elsewhere does the idea of instrumental music inhere in the word. On page 64 of my book is this statement: "Those who claim that a given passage authorizes instrumental music because it contains the word *psallo* are guilty of the *petitio principii*, or the fallacy of *begging the question*. They assume the very point in dispute by assuming that the use of a musical instrument inheres in the word. *No lexicographer known to the author has ever so claimed.*" Hence, it has not been and is not now my intention to deny that *psallo* could, at any time, even now in the twentieth century, be properly used in a connection where the idea of instrumental music is conveyed, but, as just shown in examples from Clement, when it is so used, that idea is conveyed by other words and not by *psallo*. The idea of instrumental music does not inhere in the word. During the New Testament period it meant, and means now, to *sing*, and in harmony with

this thought it was distinctly demonstrated in the chapter on the passage from Lucian that all he meant when he said, "It is impossible to *psallein* without a lyre," was that it is impossible to *psallein* without some object or instrument with which to *psallein*. And while in the New Testament, as in other modern Greek literature, the word simply means to sing, yet with a direct allusion to its ancient application to striking the chords of a musical instrument, the New Testament specifies "the heart" as the instrument with which Christians are to *psallein*. Hence, when Paul said in Greek, "I will *psalo* with the spirit, and I will *psalo* with the understanding also" (1 Cor. 14: 15), he meant in English: "I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also."

CHAPTER IX.

MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS.

There are several matters coming within the scope of this review which thus far have not received specific treatment and to which, because it is hoped they will serve still further to clarify the general issue in debate, it is now deemed proper to call attention. As has substantially appeared in all preceding chapters, the leading purpose of this review is to examine testimony which is supposed to throw light on the meaning of *psallo* in the New Testament; and the items to which reference is here made come under this head.

1. *The bearing of the Lucian passage on the general meaning of "psallo" at that time.* In Chapter VII., which treats of that passage at length, the following statement was made:

"The famous passage in question not only does not determine, but it does not even touch the question as to whether instrumental or vocal music is signified by the

term *psallo* in its general usage at that time. However, it is the purpose to consider, in another place in this review, the bearing which it may be thought the passage has on this particular point."

First of all, it is proper here to refresh the reader's mind with two vital points which were definitely established in Chapter VII.: (1) That the term "lyre" in the passage, "it is impossible to *psallein* without a lyre," does not merely mean the musical instrument signified by that term, but any instrument whatever with which it is possible to *psallein*. Any other view of the passage would inescapably commit Lucian to the absurdity of teaching that there was but one musical instrument in the world with which it was possible to *psallein*! (2) That since the passage, in the light of its context and every other consideration, merely teaches that there must be *some* instrument before there can be *psalloing*, it follows that this particular passage determines nothing whatever as to what that instrument shall be.

Now, from these considerations, with all the premises furnished by the passage itself and by its context, and reasoning purely from the logic of all the facts taken at their full value, I respectfully maintain that it is utterly impossible to say, with absolute certainty, that instrumental music is signified by the passage at all. I do not say it is not. On the other hand, I would modestly refrain from dogmatism in a case where the logic of a situation so plainly forbids it. Hence, so far as the Lucian passage standing alone is concerned, avoiding any opinionated view that it supports either kind of music as against the other, I merely contend that, from all the premises in hand, no one can logically draw the conclusion that instrumental music is necessarily signified by the passage, for the simple reason that, when it is once established, as it had already been abundantly established in this case, that "lyre" in the passage merely means that *some* instrument is necessary in *psalloing*, it still remains an open and unsettled question as to what that instrument shall be with which the *psalloing* is done—"whether," as stated in Chapter

VII., "with the human heart, as in song, or with an instrument made by human hands, as in instrumental music." And hence the conclusion is inevitable that the passage has no essential bearing at all on the current meaning of *psallo* in its general usage at that time; and therefore the oft-repeated and overworked assumption about the passage in the book here under review is utterly groundless without a solitary fact to sustain it.

2. *The fatal conclusion of the book.* In addition to the significant facts presented in Chapter II. on "the conclusion necessitated by the title-page," I wish now to show that it is not only a fact that the fatal conclusion there pointed out necessarily follows from the premises laid down in the book, but that the author of the book actually avows that conclusion, openly committing himself to the position that *it is impossible to obey God in the command in psallo without instrumental music.* The case does not call for argument further than a mere appeal to the facts. I shall, therefore, present the matter in his own explicit words and leave our readers to draw their own conclusion. Though he makes some gingerly approaches to it, yet he does not, in outspoken fashion, adopt that conclusion at the beginning of his argument, but he finally reaches it and announces it categorically and boldly. On page 52, taking a very pronounced step in that direction, he says: "The wonder is whether, with so much conclusive testimony, very many of those who shall come to see that they have been mistaken, will now declare that instrumental music *unavoidably inheres in psallo*, and that therefore to employ it is mandatory." That is strong language, but the position it sets forth is not only justified, but positively demanded, as we have seen, by his untenable construction of the language of Lucian. The reader will note also that it is the very opposite position for which I contend—namely, *that instrumental music does not inhere in the word "psallo" at all.*

Again, on page 311, referring to what he seems to think will be the future developments in the *psallo* controversy growing out of his book, he says: "Henceforth the ques-

tion will not be, 'Are we at liberty to use instruments?' With the inherent meaning now so clearly shown, we may well ask, 'Does *psallo* make playing mandatory as *aeido* does singing?'" That is another significant and strong statement, but not too strong for the premises he has laid down.

But on page 172, boldly announcing for himself and for his readers the conclusion which he calls upon them all to adopt, he says: "We must unite in agreeing that if we forego musical instruments, we cannot conform to the divine injunction to *psallein*." There, clear as the sunlight and without any mincing of words, we have it. The position that "the divine injunction to *psallein*" *cannot be obeyed without instrumental music* is clearly, distinctly, and openly avowed. Hence, according to his teaching, every church of God in the world to-day which does not have and use in its worship an organ or some other musical instrument made by human hands is in open rebellion against God. With him, it is no longer even a question of *liberty*, but a question of *absolute requirement*. Hence, according to the doctrine which he now boldly avows, *instrumental music* is as much in *psallo* as *immerse* is in *baptizo*, and we are no more doing what is commanded in *psallo* till we play an instrument of music than we are doing what is commanded in *baptizo* till we immerse. No matter whether any of the churches shall ever accept the unreasonable and absurd doctrine or not, it is clearly and indisputably the doctrine of this book and of its author. Neither is it any more absurd and preposterous than many other things have been found to be in this book. In fact, if ever a book deserved a premium for such things, I think this one deserves it.

3. *His treatment of the Revised Version.* After seeing, as exposed in a former chapter, that the author of this book actually presumes to sit in judgment on the scholarship of Sophocles, the renowned Harvard professor and eminent Greek lexicographer of the Roman and Byzantine periods, our readers should not be surprised to find that he presumes to act in the same rôle toward that illustrious

company of similar American and English scholars who, between the years 1870 and 1885, produced for the English-speaking world the eminent Revision of the King James or Authorized Version of the Bible; and I leave them to form their own idea of what it means as to himself when an author, for any reason, casts slurs and insinuations upon such a body of men. For example, he not only speaks of the Revisers as making an effort "to save the Prayer Book and throw dust in the reader's eyes" (page 115), but, not able to meet the unanswerable fact that these world-renowned translators, both of the Authorized Version and of the Revised Version, translated *psalms* into English by "sing" and not by "play," and referring to the use made of this fact by the opposition, he says: "To what, then, in their desperation, do they essay to cling? To the word 'sing' and the fact that 'scholarly (?) Revisers' permitted it to still stand in lieu of *psalms*." (Page 204.)

Now, was that ever surpassed or even equaled? Think of the slur in that interrogation point in parenthesis after the word "scholarly!" Think of who cast the slur and on whom it is cast! What does it mean? *It means that the author of this book presumes to call in question the scholarship of that eminent body of Revisers!!* But who were the Revisers? That the general public, as far as my book might be read, might appreciate the bearing and weight of their authority in settling the meaning of *psalms*, I took pains, in the course of its preparation, to tell who the Revisers are, and I here copy the statement:

"Even the half dozen men with whom the great enterprise originated about forty years ago, together with the thirty-nine scholars invited by the Convocation of Canterbury to assist in the work, constituted a company of men whose scholarship and varied learning were sufficient to command the respect and admiration of the literary world; but when this number was subsequently augmented by another list of names with equally brilliant attainments, which brought the whole number of Revisers to sixty-seven on the British side, and which has since been known as the English Company of Revisers, there was a body of men which, for broad and varied learning in the field of Bibli-

cal research, was perhaps seldom ever equaled and never surpassed.

"But this is not all. Soon after the work of forming the English Company was well under way, its promoters decided to invite the coöperation of certain eminent American scholars; and, accordingly, there were appointed in this country two Companies corresponding to the two English Companies—one for the Old Testament and the other for the New, the late William Henry Green, of Princeton, Chairman of the former, and the late Theodore D. Woolsey, ex-President of Yale University, Chairman of the latter. In all, there were, on the British side, thirty-seven members of the Old Testament Company, and thirty of the New Testament Company; and on the American side, fifteen in the Old Testament Company, and nineteen in the New Testament Company, making a grand total, including all on both sides of the Atlantic, of one hundred and one scholars." (See *Instrumental Music in the Worship*, pages 86, 87.)

Now, when our readers stop to reflect that the author of such a book as the one here under review can get the consent of his mind to pronounce adversely on the scholarship of such a company of men, they will have another significant pointer as to how far such a book itself is likely to be worthy of their confidence.

4. *A strange and suggestive contrast.* To enable our readers further to form a just estimate of the book here under review as a strictly sectarian and partisan production rather than an unprejudiced and impartial examination of facts upon their own merits, I here follow its author's disparaging opinion of the great work of the English and American Revisers with his very high opinion of his own work. The contrast is as suggestive as it is vivid. He not only intimates on page 42 the "joy" which his book will bring "to that great and noble company who, tiring of discord, long for union," and significantly adds that his "own pleasure will be marred by the thought of the fearful responsibility which" his "work unavoidably places upon some," but on pages 100 and 101, speaking again of his own book, he says: "That the volume you now hold presents to you, dear reader, more information regarding the meaning of *psalms* than was ever beheld by

any translator or body of translators, there can be scarcely a doubt." That certainly puts the merits of his book in the superlative degree, so far as his own opinion is concerned. He not only sets aside that illustrious company of scholars, one hundred and one in number, who spent fifteen years of arduous labor in making the Revision, but at one fell swoop he brushes aside "any translator or body of translators" in all history and actually declares that his book furnishes "more information regarding the meaning of *psallo* than" any or all of them combined "ever beheld"!! That is, no one of them nor all of the one hundred and one scholars of the Revision combined, nor any other number of scholars in all the ages, "ever beheld" the amount of "information" on *psallo* this man is able to give! But, in spite of this note of high praise sounded by himself about his book, and to say nothing of numerous other defects which this review has disclosed, when our readers remember that its author so signally missed the mark even on where *psallo* does or does not occur in Clement as to claim *eighteen* instances when really there are only *six*, they will probably have some "doubt" about both the *quantity* and the *quality* of "information" about *psallo* imparted by this book.

5. *The claim that the translation of psallo by "sing" does not "preclude the use of the instrument."* Evidently feeling, in spite of his reflection upon their work, the force of the translation by the Revisers, he attempts to break it by quoting Professors Riddle and Dwight, members of the American Committee, as saying they "do not think" or had "no recollection" that the Revisers intended "to preclude the use of the instrument" (pages 308-309), and on pages 268 and 269 he asks: "Can a fair mind believe that the Revisers intended to exclude instruments, or that it is honest to quote them or their Revision against the instrument, in view of these statements?" Most assuredly "a fair mind" can so "believe." Of course no mortal but the Revisers themselves could know what they "intended" or did not "intend," but that is not the question and has nothing whatever to do with the question. It is astonish-

ing that any thoughtful person would think that it has anything to do with it. Moreover, his statement on page 268, "Surely the Revisers know their own meaning," is wide of the mark and has nothing to do with the question. We are not only in no wise concerned about what the Revisers "intended" or did not "intend," but we do not have to consult them about their meaning. If they did not mean what they said, the fact would be a sad reflection upon them; and as to the meaning of what they said, *another court has exclusive jurisdiction here—namely, the court of English lexicography.* Hence, we do not need, and are in no wise concerned with, what Gentlemen Dwight and Riddle or any other members of the Revision Committee think, believe, or know, except in so far as they have expressed themselves in their translation. For the meaning of the English words used in their translation or for what is included or excluded, we are in no sense dependent on them. In the lexical argument in Chapter III. this statement was made:

"A lexicon, then, is 'to fix the bounds' or 'to mark the limits of' words. Of course this means that it must fix such 'bounds' or such 'limits' as include *all that belongs to the meaning of the word*, and everything not so included is excluded. Hence the correct definition of words is both inclusive and exclusive. It includes all that the word means, and whatever it does not include is excluded from the meaning of the word; otherwise it is no correct definition at all."

I respectfully add that the Revisers were not engaged in a work to regulate the worship of God or anything else by what they "intended" or did not "intend," except in so far as their intentions were expressed in their translation. *They were engaged in translating Hebrew and Greek into English, and they translated "psallo" by sing.* That settles it. We know what "sing" means, and we know it has no musical instrument in it except the voice. It neither includes nor excludes an *instrument* any more than it includes or excludes the *dance*. It has nothing to do with either. Of course we can use an *instrument* when we *sing*, just as we can *dance* when we *sing*, but neither

the instrument nor the dance is in the word "sing." Some of the strongest witnesses he summons to help him on what the word includes and excludes show that they themselves feel the force of this unanswerable fact and cannot meet it. On page 301, Prof. William Hardy Alexander, of the Department of Greek and Latin in the University of Alberta, says of *psallo*: "In New Testament Greek, it has, no doubt, the meaning to sing, to make music with the human instrument, but there is nothing whatever to show that this idea excludes accompaniment." Of course not, and "there is nothing whatever to show that this idea excludes" *dancing*, but neither dancing nor the "accompaniment" is in the word *psallo* or *sing*; and, in its New Testament usage, Professor Alexander is forced to tell us plainly that there is "no doubt" about its "meaning to sing, to make music with the human instrument." And on pages 285 and 286, J. Corrión Hutchinson, Emeritus Professor of Greek in the University of Minnesota, says: "It did not necessarily, in common usage, imply an instrument, nor did it necessarily imply the lack of an instrument." Exactly so, the idea of the instrument *not being in the word*, the word neither implied the *presence* of the instrument nor the *absence* of it. In other words, the idea not being in the word at all, it, of course, *had nothing to do with it*. It does not mean "to play an instrument," except, as Professor Alexander says, "to make music with the human instrument."

Hence, that eminent English classic, the Revised Version of 1881 and 1885, representing, in a body of one hundred and one men, the broadest and profoundest scholarship of both Europe and America, stands as a mighty bulwark of strength in support of the contention that *psallo* in the New Testament means to sing. Moreover, its illustrious predecessor, the King James or Authorized Version, made three hundred years ago by another similar company of learned men of that time, in spite of the fact that the religious body, the Anglican Church, under which it was brought forth, favors and practices instrumental music in the worship, stands as another tower of strength in

support of the same contention. In fine, the unanimous verdict of the eminent translators of both the Authorized and Revised Versions of the Bible is that the term *psallo*, at the opening of the New Testament period, had come to mean to sing, and they so translate the word in the New Testament. This argument has never been answered, and I am profoundly convinced that it never will be.

6. *A remarkable contradiction.* On page 172, commenting on the passage from Lucian, "it is impossible to *psallein* without a lyre," the author of this book, as already quoted in another connection, categorically declares: "If we forego musical instruments, we cannot conform to the divine injunction to *psallein*." But, on page 264, he quotes Professor Ropes, of Harvard University, as categorically saying: "The word does not necessarily imply the use of an instrument." Thus, the author of this book says that the use of the instrument "inheres" in *psallo*, is necessarily implied by it, and that "we cannot conform to the divine injunction" without it; but his eminent Harvard witness and Greek professor says it does not inhere in it and that "the word does not necessarily imply the use of an instrument!" He says it *does*, but his *witness* says it *does not*; and I am inclined to believe that all impartial and well-informed readers will agree with his witness.

7. *The general character of the book.* By this I do not mean its literary character, for with this feature of the book I have been but little concerned. I refer purely and exclusively to its logical character, including its manner of dealing with authorities. In addition to the illogical feature, instance after instance of positive suppression and perversion of the language of authorities has been given in this review until the utter unreliability of the book, as a whole, has been clearly and incontrovertibly established. That is, in view of such facts, one cannot know, without information from some other source, that any given thing found in this book may not have been dealt with in precisely the same way, and, therefore, the book is unreliable.

And hence, finally, concerning any passage that has not been subjected to examination in this review, I now make

the general observation that a cause which, in order to make itself appear plausible, has to resort, at one point, to the suppression of some and the addition of other vital words and phrases in connection with quotations from authorities, is not likely to be able to present anything, at another point, that could not be similarly exposed or answered in some other way. Furthermore, in the light of his incorrect use of Lucian and Clement, I do not hesitate to say that I believe the language of any other author whom he attempts to use in support of instrumental music in *psallo* in the New Testament, if critically examined in the light of its context and other facts, could be shown to support no such idea. I have the very best of reasons for this belief—namely, the fact that the world's greatest Greek-English lexicographers covering the New Testament period as a specialty, Thayer and Sophocles, say, *by the definitions in their lexicons*, that they found no example at all in that period with such a meaning. Moreover, in the list of authorities consulted by Sophocles in the preparation of his great lexicon are some of the most prominent authorities, mentioned in his list specifically by name, which this book parades as supporting its contention. Does the reader believe that two such great lights as Thayer and Sophocles would examine such authorities and not be able to find in them anything which the author of this book could find? With all due respect for all on both sides of the controversy, I do not hesitate to record my profound conviction that all well-informed and impartial readers will answer this question in the negative. Beyond all reasonable doubt, *psallo* in the New Testament means to sing.

CHAPTER X.

THE CASE OF JUSTIN MARTYR, WITH MORE MISREPRESENTATION EXPOSED, AND CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS.

In this concluding chapter, in addition to an examination of the case of Justin Martyr, it is the purpose to present other reflections growing out of the general theme under discussion, and which have a practical bearing on the issue involved. Further examination of original documents has disclosed additional significant facts, and they will assist the reader in forming a final and just estimate of the book here under review. Hence, I now invite attention to the following items:

1. *The case of Justin Martyr.* This eminent "Church Father" lived the first half of the second century of the Christian era, thus following immediately upon the apostolic age. According to the accepted dates, Justin was born A.D. 100 and died A.D. 165; Lucian was born A.D. 120 and died A.D. 200; and Clement of Alexandria was born A.D. 150 and died A.D. 220. Hence, Justin was twenty years old when Lucian was born and fifty years old when Clement was born, and the latter was fifteen years old when Justin died, all of which shows that the three were contemporaries for fifteen years, and that all lived near the apostolic age.

When I wrote "the general observation" in item 7 of Chapter IX., it was not my intention to present, in this review, the facts concerning any other specific case, for the simple reason that more than enough had already been given to show that the book, as a whole, is utterly unreliable; but it subsequently occurred to me that it would add to the clearness and completeness of the review to present, by transliteration and translation, an ocular demonstration showing how this man manipulates the original of authors to make them appear to support his position. From an examination of the original, we have seen in Chapters VII. and VIII. how he dealt with Lucian and Clement; and I

am now prepared to say that a similar examination of the original of Justin discloses an equally gross misrepresentation of their illustrious contemporary, thus verifying, so far as Justin is concerned, the conviction expressed in Chapter IX. that "the language of any other author whom he attempts to use in support of instrumental music in *psallo* in the New Testament, if critically examined in the light of its context and other facts, could be shown to support no such idea." In this case, as in the others, I shall simply give the facts and let our readers judge for themselves and draw their own conclusion.

On pages 135-138 this man gives three passages which he professes to quote from Justin Martyr, and represents Justin as saying one time "play the harp," five times "play on the harp," and one time "playing on an instrument;" and, hence, his readers who know nothing more about what Justin says than what they get in this book will, of course, conclude that Justin taught in favor of instrumental music in the worship. But, since writing Chapter IX., I have carefully examined every word of all three passages in the original of Justin's work entitled "Dialogue with Trypho, the Jew," and *Justin says no such thing*. There is not a solitary word in any one of the passages about playing the harp or playing any other such instrument. To make this perfectly plain, I shall give the three passages just as this man gives them, and side by side the same passages in the standard English translation of them in the "Ante-Nicene Fathers" series; and, for the benefit of those who read the original and also to show the English reader the scheme by which Justin and others are made to *appear* to support the instrumental-music cause, I will transliterate one of the passages which will expose the scheme used in all of them. Here are the passages as he gives them:

"As the Spirit urges those from all the earth who recognize this salutary mystery—I. e., the suffering of Christ, through which he saved them—to sing (*adontas*) and play the harp (*psallontes*) continually."

" . . . David sang (these words) while playing [*ep-sallen*] on an instrument; Isaiah proclaimed them; Zechariah spread them abroad; Moses wrote them."

"God has gone up with a shout; the Lord with the sound of a trumpet. Play on the harp [*psalate*] to our God; play on the harp [*psalate*]. Play on the harp [*psalate*] to our King; play on the harp [*psalate*]. For God is King of all the earth; play on the harp [*psalate*] understandingly; for God has ruled over the nations."

Now the following are the same passages taken *verbatim* from the "Ante-Nicene Fathers," and they show, according to this high authority, what Justin really said:

"He bids the inhabitants of all the earth, who have known the mystery of this salvation, i. e., the suffering of Christ, by which he saved them, sing and give praises to God the Father of all things." (Volume I., page 235.)

"These words have neither been prepared by me, nor embellished by the art of man, but David sung them, Isaiah preached them, Zechariah proclaimed them, and Moses wrote them." (Volume I., page 209.)

"God went up in a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet. Sing ye to our God, sing ye; sing to our King, sing ye; for God is King of all the earth; sing with understanding. God has ruled over the nations." (Volume I., page 213.)

Thus, as our readers can see for themselves, there is not a word in any one of the passages about the harp or any other such instrument. How, then, came such words in the passages as quoted in this book? *The author of the book put them there!* Justin neither mentioned the harp nor any other such instrument. Justin simply said *psalate*, which means "sing ye." Now, to expose the scheme adopted to make it appear that Justin supports instrumental music in the worship, I transliterate one of the passages:

"*Anebee ho Theos en alalagmooi, Kurios en phooneei salpiggos. Psalate tooi Theooi heemoon; psalate. Psalate tooi basilei heemoon, psalate; hoti basileus tees gees ho Theos; psalate sunetoos.*"

"*Psalate*" is a form of *psallo*. Hence, let our readers look over the transliteration, and wherever "*psalate*"

occurs they will see the place where the author of the book here under review, *begging the whole question—assuming as true the very thing he was under obligation to prove to be true—deliberately took upon himself to insert the words “play on the harp,” with “psalate” in brackets immediately following, thus leaving his misguided English readers to think that Justin had said that!!* Instead of Justin saying it, this man simply *assumed* it to be the meaning of *psallo* and deliberately *put it there himself!*

Now, I propose to show that, in precisely the same way, Justin or any other author who uses the word *baptizo* can be used to prove that it means to *sprinkle, pour, or stain*. All that is necessary is just to *assume* that *baptizo* means to sprinkle, pour, or stain, just as this man *assumed* that *psallo* meant to “play on the harp,” and then, quoting a passage with *baptizo* in it, just as he quoted a passage with *psallo* in it, deliberately insert “sprinkle, pour, or stain,” and follow it immediately with *baptizo* in brackets, just as he deliberately inserted “play on the harp” and followed it immediately with *psallo* in brackets, *and the work is done!* To demonstrate this, I have taken the pains to select a passage with *baptizo* in it from the same work of Justin, and I will now prove, by this man’s scheme, that *baptizo* in Justin means to sprinkle or stain. I select a passage from Chapter LXXXVI. of the “Dialogue with Trypho the Jew,” and in the “Ante-Nicene Fathers” series it is thus rendered into English with *baptizo* rendered “plunged:”

“Even as our Christ, by being crucified on the tree, and by purifying us with water, has redeemed us though plunged in the direst offenses which we have committed, and has made us a house of prayer and adoration.” (Volume I., page 242.)

The term “plunged” is *baptizo* in the original in the participial form (*bebaptismenous*), and the first nine words of the passage, transliterated, are as follows:

“*Hoos kai heemas bebaptismenous tais barutatais hamartiais, has epraxamen.*”

Now, according to this man's scheme, here it is in English: "Even also us, being sprinkled or stained (*bebaptismenous*) with the gravest sins, which we have committed," etc. That is an absolutely correct and clear rendering of the whole nine words into English, except that, supposing myself to have a theory that *baptizo* means to sprinkle or stain, which I wish to use Justin to uphold, I put "sprinkled or stained" just before *bebaptismenous*, and *make it mean what I want it to mean*, precisely as the author of this book at each occurrence of *psallo* placed "play on the harp" immediately before it, and thus *proved* (?) that *psallo* means to "play on a harp" precisely as I have *proved* (?) that *baptizo* means to "sprinkle or stain"!

In order to demonstrate, from contextual as well as philological considerations, what word most likely conveys the original idea, it is not improper, in such cases, to try different words; and in such a case it could easily be shown that "plunge," "whelm," or some such word is *demanded* and that "sprinkle or stain" is *forbidden* by the context of the foregoing nine words as the meaning of *baptizo* in Justin; but it is *not* true that anything in his passages from Justin with *psallo* in them *demand*s "play on the harp" and *forbids* "sing" as its meaning. On the contrary, *sing*, as seen in the "Ante-Nicene Fathers" rendering, makes complete sense and meets every demand of the context. It is contrary to all principles of correct translation to *assume* a meaning not demanded by the context or other consideration and to foist it upon a word as both he and I did in the foregoing passages with *psallo* and *baptizo*; but the illustration shows that his scheme *proves* (?) that *baptizo* in Justin means "sprinkle or stain" precisely as it *proves* (?) that *psallo* in Justin means "play on the harp."

2. *The apostles and the temple worship.* It is claimed that because the apostles and other Christians went into the Jewish temple where instruments were used in the worship, therefore they used the instruments in their worship, and hence Christians to-day may thus use such instruments. On page 235 the author of this book says: "The

apostles and the whole church for a time after Pentecost, continued to worship in the temple," and "musical instruments in great variety were employed in temple worship." Well, what if "the apostles and the whole church" did go there to "worship," and what if "instruments in great variety were employed in temple worship?" How does that prove that the apostles and other Christians used the said instruments in their worship? Does it follow that because instruments "were employed in temple worship" and the early Christians went there and worshiped, therefore the early Christians employed those instruments in their worship? If so, then *much more than that follows*, and the authors of this logic will likely get tired of it themselves; for it is also a fact that the burning of incense was a part, *and a very conspicuous part*, of the "temple worship," and since it follows, according to this man, that because the Christians went there to worship they worshiped in accordance with the temple worship, *therefore they burnt incense in their worship*, and therefore *Christians now should burn incense in their worship*. If not, why not? It is a dictum of logic that whatever proves too much proves nothing, and this, as our readers can see, is a conspicuous example of it. There is simply no escape here. Instruments were no more prominent in temple worship than the burning of incense, and if the mere fact that the Christians went there to worship proves that they did whatever was in the temple worship, then they burnt incense, and the churches must burn incense to-day! So much for the logic of this book.

3. *Another important item connected with Justin.* Some things are wholly unbelievable until facts force them upon us. Here is a case in point. Our readers have not only seen the eagerness with which the author of this book has attempted to use Justin in support of the instrumental-music cause, but they have seen that he took upon himself to attach to *psallo*, as used by Justin, the meaning to "play on a harp," thus making the impression that Justin so taught. But, as we shall now see, the case is worse than this. On several pages of his book, to prove different things,

and among them that instruments were used in the temple, at the beginning of the Christian era, he quotes and justly magnifies the "*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*," edited by Dr. James Hastings, as a renowned and eminently reliable authority, referring to it as "this great work" and "one of the leading authorities of the world" (page 85), and "the monumental work now issuing from the press under the able editorship of Dr. James Hastings," and that it "furnishes an exhaustive, informing article on Christian music," and he refers to Dr. Hastings himself as one "who no longer needs a string of suffixes to his name to give him standing in the world of letters" (page 249). That is high praise, and I heartily indorse it; but I have a special reason for calling attention to his great pains and conspicuous effort to exalt and magnify the "*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*." Here it is: On page 273 here is the way this man quotes from this world-renowned encyclopedia:

"In the Hebrew temple, at the beginning of the Christian era, the harp, lute, flute, trumpet and drum were used as accompaniment to psalms and canonical hymns; yet, owing to the necessity of avoiding comparison with pagan rites, instrumental music was forbidden in the early Christian church. On the other hand, Clement of Alexandria, in the second century, quoting the psalmist in favor of instrumental music, says," etc.

Now, having copied it with my own hand, I will give verbatim the same passage in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, and I will put in italics the part which this man suppressed from his readers. Here it is:

"In the Hebrew temple, at the beginning of the Christian era the harp, lute, flute, trumpet and drum were used as accompaniment to the psalms and canonical hymns; yet, owing to the necessity of avoiding comparison with pagan rites, instrumental music was forbidden in the early Christian church. *Justin Martyr argues against it.* On the other hand, Clement of Alexandria, also in the second century, quoting the psalmist in favor of instrumental music, says," etc. (*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Volume IX., page 31.)

Let the reader carefully compare the two quotations. Why did he suppress from his readers *that italicized statement*? In the face of the fact that he had not only perverted Justin's own words in order to make him *appear* to support instrumental music, but had exalted and magnified the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* as a great authority, our readers can draw their own conclusion as to why he would suppress and thus carefully keep from his readers the important and valuable statement of that great work that "*Justin Martyr argues against*" instrumental music. And yet, in spite of these significant facts, referring to those who differ from him on the music question, and in immediate connection with one of his quotations from that great authority, he has the face to say: "Pity him who is so filled with a theory that he cannot imbibe truth, and who, from habit, repels everything which contradicts his views"! (Page 245.) I know nothing of his ability to "imbibe truth," nor whether he "repels everything which contradicts his views," and I therefore do not presume to say; but I *do know* that, either "from habit" or for some other reason, *he suppresses the truth sometimes and does not let his readers see it*. In the case of this "exhaustive, informing article on Christian music" he suppressed one of its most "informing" things. And I do not hesitate to express the judgment that lectures from such a source on prejudice and being "filled with a theory" will likely be estimated at their true value by right-thinking persons.

4. *How lexicons say things*. In my book, "Instrumental Music in the Worship," page 47, referring to the period B.C. 146 and A.D. 1100, the period covered by the great lexicon of Sophocles, this statement is made:

"As the basis of his monumental work, this profound and tireless scholar examined, as we have found by actual count, 146 secular and 77 ecclesiastical authors of the Roman period, and 109 secular and 262 ecclesiastical, modern Greek, and scholastic authors of the Byzantine period, a grand total of 594 authors and covering a period of more than 1,200 years, and he declares that there is not a single example of *psallo* throughout this long period in-

volving or implying the use of an instrument, but says that it meant always and everywhere 'to chant, sing religious hymns.'

The author of the book here under review attempts to make the impression that in that passage I said about Sophocles and his lexicon what is not true. Here is his curt comment on it: "Which statement Sophocles never made, nor any other upon the subject." (Page 253.) Without stopping here to discuss the lack of civility in such a comment in such a connection, I merely raise the question, *How do lexicons say things?* When I say that Sophocles "declares that there is not a single example of *psallo* throughout this long period involving or implying the use of an instrument," considerate and thoughtful readers will clearly see that I did not, in that passage, state *how* Sophocles "declares" that fact; and if he declared it *in any way at all*, my statement is true. Lexicographers say or declare things both by what they *put in* their lexicons and by what they *leave out*. For example, when the first American edition of Liddell and Scott under the editorship of Henry Drisler, of Columbia College, appeared in 1846 with "pour upon" as a definition of *baptizo*, did they not, by that fact, "declare" that they had found an example of *baptizo* meaning to "pour upon?" And when their next edition appeared with "pour upon" expunged, did they not, by that fact, declare that they were mistaken in the first case, and did they not then, and do they not now, "declare that there is not a single example of *baptizo* throughout" Greek literature meaning to "pour upon?" If they mean what they did, they declare that they find no such example.

Moreover, suppose somebody should say of the definition of *baptizo* by Liddell and Scott, since they expunged "pour upon," that the remaining definition does not "preclude" or "exclude" pouring and sprinkling, what should we say in reply? Is it not enough to say that the very fact that they do not *include* pouring and sprinkling in their definitions is a *loud declaration on their part* that such definitions do not belong there, but are excluded? If not, why

not? Yet on page 77 of his book, referring to Sophocles' definition of *psallo* "to chant, sing religious hymns," this man says: "Even his definition of *psallo* in no sense excludes accompaniment." Why not? Does it exclude dancing? If so, how? So far as the meaning of the word is concerned, does it not exclude it by not including it?

5. *The significant uncertainty of some of his most prominent witnesses.* It is a most significant circumstance that a large number of the witnesses introduced in this book to uphold the instrumental music cause show, by their gingerly phraseology, that, as scholars, they are by no means certain about the ground they occupy; that they are decidedly loath to take an out-and-out stand against the opposition in this controversy; and that it is very probably their training and theological bias in favor of instrumental music in the worship that leads them to support the practice at all. For example, just look at the following:

(1) Professor Richard Goetheil, Chief of the Oriental Division, New York Public Library: "I think your contention that *psallo*, in the New Testament, indicates the instrument, is correct." "I think that the Hebrew *zamar* means originally 'to play an instrument, to make music.'" (Page 284.) Exactly. "I think"! And such a wary answer makes intelligent readers "think."

(2) Addison Hogue, Washington and Lee University: "I should not say that an instrumental accompaniment is necessarily precluded." (Page 292.)

(3) Dr. Alfred T. Leach, University of Saskatchewan: "All evidence, I think, goes to show that musical accompaniment was a necessary part of the rendering of the *psalmos*." (Page 293.) He, too, is not certain, but 'thinks"! I commend his honesty.

(4) Professor W. A. Macdonell, Presbyterian Theological College, Saskatchewan: "I think I can safely say that it is right to translate *psallein* in Rom. 15: 9 and 1 Cor. 14: 15 by the word 'sing,' and that it also included the idea of musical accompaniment." (Page 296.)

(5) Dr. Richard T. Elliott, editor of Aristophanes, etc.:

"What strikes attention specially in the case of the use in the Septuagint, is that, in the great majority of cases where *psallo* is used, the translation of the corresponding Hebrew words in the Revised Version and by other leading scholars is 'to sing' or 'sing praises,' a meaning which I think cannot be said to be necessary in any case that I have seen in classical or ordinary Greek." (Page 298.) Just imagine what the great lexicons of Thayer and Sophocles would be, compared with what they are, *if they rested on nothing more certain than these half-baked and hesitating statements!*

(6) Professor C. F. Smith, Department of Greek in the University of Wisconsin: "I do not think 'sing,' the translation of *psallo* in Rom. 15: 9 and 1 Cor. 14: 15, necessarily precludes instrumental accompaniment in either passage." (Page 304.)

(7) Professor Campbell Bonner, University of Michigan: "In the New Testament, I think a musical accompaniment is to be supposed." (Page 305.)

Now, in all candor I ask, what do our readers think of a practical theory in religion which, though it involves the solemn matter of obedience to God, stands on no higher ground than "I think," "I should not say," "I think goes to show," "I think I can safely say," "I do not think sing necessarily precludes instrumental accompaniment," and "I think a musical accompaniment is to be supposed?" "To be supposed" indeed! Where is the word of God? *Can we not stand on the rock of certainty?* With all due deference for all concerned, I respectfully add that, on the basis of such flimsy talk, Christians can "think" into the service and worship of God *anything they want*, from the playing of instruments to infant baptism, sprinkling and pouring, burning incense, and anything else throughout the whole list of denominational practices. Why not? How vastly and radically different it is from the position that stands on a positive "Thus saith the Lord!"

6. *The divine rule for the government of Christians in worship.* Here it is in two passages from the Lord him-

self: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you." (Matt. 23: 20.) "In vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men." (Matt. 15: 9.) Thus, the positive side of the rule says they are to do *acts* which he has "commanded." As to music in his worship, he commands us in the Greek New Testament to *psallo*; but *psallo* in English means to *sing*. Hence, he commands us to sing. He does not command us to play. The latter is not among the "all things" which he "commanded." "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you." The negative side of the rule distinctly points out that doing anything which he has *not* "commanded," but is merely "the precept of men," is vain worship. Of course "the precepts of men" are what *men* say, and not what *God* says. In the present case, God says "*sing*," and men say "*play*."

7. *The case for instrumental music in Christian worship not made out.* The book which has been reviewed in these chapters is not only an effort to uphold an act of worship *not* "commanded" by the Lord, but that effort is marked by gross misrepresentation and even by the suppression of vital statements in some of the authorities which it professes to quote. From both the Biblical and logical points of view, I have never read a document which, under the light of critical examination, proved to be more thoroughly inconclusive. It is a massive compilation of heterogeneous quotations, a large per cent of which not only have no relevancy to the point in dispute, but many of which, when critically examined, are found to be either downright misrepresentations or otherwise void of proof; and I hesitate not to say that this feature of the work alone, and especially its suppression of such authorities as Thayer, Sophocles, and the "Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics," no matter what the motive, is enough, in the estimation of all right-thinking people, justly to consign the book to oblivion. Christians, no matter what their differences, should deal honorably with each other and with all questions, and even the advocates of instrumental music, instead of commending

and circulating, should spurn such a defense of their cause; and when he says "the impelling purpose in the research that produced" his book "came from a love for truth" (page 8), thoughtful and unprejudiced readers, on both sides of the controversy, will likely feel disposed to reply: "Why, then, did you suppress it when quoting Thayer, Sophocles, and others?" Either because its author himself had some appreciation of this inherent weakness in his ponderous mass of quotations or for some other reason, instead of leaving his book to speak for itself, he seems to feel it necessary to be constantly saying something favorable about it; and hence his pages are marked with such expressions as "my extensive research," what "one of our most loved editors" said "when informed of the results of the present research," or other things that transpired "in the research," "during the research," and how "one of our leading men" said he did "wish Brother McGarvey had lived to see this," and, finally, as mentioned in another connection, he actually tells his readers, as if he expected them to believe it, that he has given them "more information" on *psallo* than was "ever beheld" by all the combined translators of all past ages!! I do not wonder that one of his own fellow Canadians, referring to his book in a published magazine article, says: "The one thing remarkable about Mr. Payne's effort is the brazen-faced bombast with which he contradicts and exalts himself above the scholarship of two thousand years."

Finally, in taking my leave of this book and its author, I am forcibly reminded of Moses E. Lard's review of Dr. J. B. Jeter's notorious book, entitled "Campbellism Examined," published over a half century ago. Having pointed out what he termed "the insulting spirit of the book," as well as its thoroughly inconclusive character as an argument, the eloquent and scholarly Lard closed his pungent review with these words: "These are a few of the effects to be ascribed to Mr. Jeter's book; and with the simple statement of them, we now take leave of both him and it, feeling that in the one we part from a misguided

man, and in the other from a graceless thing." (*Review of Campbellism Examined*, page 297.) Concerning the book here reviewed and its author, I think I could not close with a more appropriate statement than to express, in the same words, my firm and sincere conviction that "in the one we part from a misguided man, and in the other from a graceless thing."

SERMON OUTLINES

A Book of One Hundred and Fifty New Sermon Outlines

Just the book for preachers, elders, deacons, Bible-class teachers, and others that take public part in church services.

The book has one hundred and fifty sermon outlines and a helpful supplement containing funeral texts, marriage ceremonies, forms for church letters, and Hedge's "Rules" for debate.

A good book to use in your Lord's-day services, prayer meetings, and young people's meetings. Let the leader announce the subject, hand slips of paper containing different sections of the outline to the members who are to take part in the next meeting, requesting them to make a talk or read the scriptural references on that section of the outline. Or, let the leader put the outline on the blackboard, omitting the scriptural references, then ask the congregation to supply the correct scriptural references at the next meeting, and to give reasons why they selected these references.

PRICE, \$1.00, POSTPAID

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN THE WORSHIP

By M. C. KURFEES

This is the most comprehensive book on this important subject now before the public. In it the Greek verb "psallo" is philologically and historically examined, together with a full discussion of kindred matters relating to music in Christian worship. The book is the result of a lifetime of critical study and research, and has become the standard of information on the music question. It has been highly recommended by scholarly brethren in the church of Christ and in the religious world.

PRICE, \$1.50, POSTPAID

McQUIDDY PRINTING COMPANY
NASHVILLE, TENN.

QUESTIONS ANSWERED

By LIPSCOMB AND SEWELL

(Edited by M. C. KURFEES)

Questions bearing on the Bible, the church, the Christian life, and kindred subjects, are constantly coming up. You need some good book to help you along this line. The new book, "Questions Answered," by David Lipscomb and E. G. Sewell, will be of great assistance to you. Those who have seen and examined it closely are highly pleased. W. A. Schultz, a very useful evangelist residing at El Paso, Texas, writes: "I have 'Questions Answered,' by Lipscomb and Sewell, compiled by Kurfees, and it contains more Bible information than any book I ever saw. I have all the works of Campbell, Milligan, Franklin, Errett, McGarvey, Rotherham, B. W. Johnson, and others of our noted preachers and educators, but none was the peer of David Lipscomb." Cloth bound; 700 pages.

PRICE, \$3.00, POSTPAID

TRAVELS IN BIBLE LANDS

By ANDY T. RITCHIE

A book giving a brief account of a four-months' trip through the countries of the East, dwelling especially on the interests of Egypt and Palestine. It is an unconditional treatise by one who has made the Bible his chief study for several years, and who made a trip for the purpose of obtaining information along the line of biblical and historical studies, and demonstrating to our boys that it does not require a million dollars to see the "Holy Land."

"It was my pleasure and profit to read 'Travels in Bible Lands' when it was first offered to the public, and I thought then, and think now, that it is one of the most interesting and profitable books that has ever been written on travels in the Holy Land."—F. W. Smith.

PRICE, \$1.50, POSTPAID

McQUIDDY PRINTING COMPANY

NASHVILLE, TENN.

LIBRARY

For Building Use Only



ABILENE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

